

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

A RUMOUR has gone abroad, far beyond the confines of the scientific world, that some profound revolution has taken place in physical science which is destined to produce an immense change on our outlook on the universe as a whole, and on our views as to the significance of human life. Thoughtful people, who do not profess in the least to be able to follow the technical discussions of the physicists and mathematicians, are anxious to learn what bearing these discussions may be found to have on human thought and human life. Many, therefore, will welcome the contribution which so great an authority as Sir JAMES JEANS has made to this discussion in his book now published—*The Mysterious Universe* (Cambridge University Press; 3s. 6d. net). It is a sequel to his astronomical work, 'The Universe around Us,' but it may be read alone.

---

The feelings of primitive man, as he looked upon the world around him and compared its vastness with his own insignificance, must have been akin to terror. As science advanced and increasingly revealed the immensity of the universe, life appeared as a negligible and, it might be, an accidental by-product. The greater part of the substance of the universe was found to be too hot for life to exist, the infinite realms of space were deadly cold, and physical science revealed an evolution whereby life would inevitably be frozen out of the tiny spot where at present it maintains a precarious foothold. 'Is this, then, all that life

amounts to? To stumble, almost by mistake, into a universe which was clearly not designed for life, and which, to all appearance, is either totally indifferent or definitely hostile to it, to stay clinging on to a fragment of a grain of sand until we are frozen off, to strut our tiny hour on our tiny stage with the knowledge that our aspirations are all doomed to final frustration, and that our achievements must perish with our race, leaving the universe as though we had never been?'

---

To this all-important question Sir JAMES JEANS addresses himself and seeks to answer it, in so far as physical science is able to provide an answer. His general conclusion is that the new knowledge compels us to revise the impression that we had stumbled into a universe which either did not concern itself with life or was actively hostile to it. 'To-day there is a wide measure of agreement, which on the physical side of science approaches almost to unanimity, that the stream of knowledge is heading towards a non-mechanical reality; the universe begins to look more like a great thought than like a great machine. Mind no longer appears as an accidental intruder into the realm of matter; we are beginning to suspect that we ought rather to hail it as the creator and governor of the realm of matter—not of course our individual minds, but the mind in which the atoms out of which our individual minds have grown exist as thoughts.'

---

This is, indeed, a revolutionary conclusion for

physical science to reach, as any one who has the least acquaintance with the physical science of the nineteenth century must know. It is impossible here to give more than a glimpse of the evidence on which this conclusion is based. Heisenberg has shown that the concepts of the quantum theory involve what he calls a 'principle of indeterminacy,' and Sir JAMES JEANS agrees with Eddington that this 'destroys the case for absolutely strict causation,' and 'cuts away the ground on which the old determinism was based.' 'The picture of the universe presented by the new physics contains more room than did the old mechanical picture for life and consciousness to exist within the picture itself, together with the attributes which we commonly associate with them, such as free-will, and the capacity to make the universe in some small degree different by our presence. . . . To-day science can no longer shut the door on this possibility, she has no longer any unanswerable arguments to bring against our innate conviction of free-will.'

---

Again, the new physics has broken down the rigid distinction between matter and energy, finding them to be but two forms of the one mysterious entity. What is known as 'cosmic radiation,' that is, the permeation of space by rays of extremely high penetrating power, cannot be accounted for except by the annihilation of matter, and this transformation must be regarded as one of the fundamental processes of the universe. 'The whole of the available evidence seems to indicate that the change is, with possible insignificant exceptions, for ever in the same direction—for ever solid matter melts into insubstantial radiation; for ever the tangible changes into the intangible.' Probably radiation will ultimately prove to be merely matter moving with the speed of light, and matter to be radiation moving with a speed less than that of light. 'These concepts reduce the whole universe to a world of light, potential or existent, so that the whole story of its creation can be told with perfect accuracy and completeness in the six words: "God said, Let there be Light."'

At the same time physicists are deeply conscious that, with all their subtle analysis of matter, they are not in touch with ultimate reality. The completeness of the many-dimensioned universe is as much beyond our comprehension as our world would be beyond the comprehension of 'a race of blind worms, whose perceptions were limited to the two-dimensional surface of the earth.' Physical science is simply dealing with symbols which do no more than point in the direction of the mysterious entity underlying all phenomena. 'The ethers and their undulations, the waves which form the universe, are in all probability fictitious.' The picture of the electrons circling in their orbits round the nucleus of the atom is just a piece of useful symbolism, and to say that the atom is a beautiful little model of the solar system is just as gross an error as to assert that the streets of the New Jerusalem are really paved with eighteen-carat gold. We were confidently taught that light was a rapid succession of waves, then more recently certain phenomena could be explained only on the assumption that light was of the nature of particles. Now science tries to combine the two by speaking of 'wavicles,' but what wavicles are nobody knows, and the essential nature of light remains a profound mystery. This, perhaps, needs emphasizing in view of the popular notion that the moral philosopher and the theologian are moving in a world of insubstantial entities, whereas the scientist is down on the bedrock of reality.

---

Has physical science, then, anything to say of the nature of this ultimate reality? Sir James Jeans has reached the conclusion that 'the universe can be best pictured, although still very imperfectly and inadequately, as consisting of pure thought, the thought of what, for want of a wider word, we must describe as a mathematical thinker.' 'Mechanics has already shot its bolt and has failed dismally, on both the scientific and philosophic side.' 'The laws which nature obeys are less suggestive of those which a machine obeys in its motion than of those which a musician obeys in writing a fugue, or a poet in composing a sonnet.' The entropy of the universe is still increasing



rapidly, and so must have had a beginning. There must have been what we may describe as a 'creation' at a time not infinitely remote. 'If the universe is a universe of thought, then its creation must have been an act of thought.' The old dualism of mind and matter seems likely to disappear, through substantial matter resolving itself into a creation and manifestation of mind. 'We discover that the universe shows evidence of a designing or controlling power that has something in common with our own individual minds—not, so far as we have discovered, emotion, morality, or æsthetic appreciation, but the tendency to think in the way which, for want of a better word, we describe as mathematical.'

So the physicist may conjecture, keeping strictly to the evidence before him. But his final word would be a caution that every one of his conclusions is frankly speculative and uncertain. 'We cannot claim to have discerned more than a very faint glimmer of light at the best. . . . So that our main contention can hardly be that the science of to-day has a pronouncement to make, perhaps it ought rather to be that science should leave off making pronouncements: the river of knowledge has too often turned back on itself.'

It is not so long ago since we talked complacently of the 'assured results' of Old Testament criticism, but any one who has been following the discussions of the last few years will be ready to admit that now a humbler and less confident mood is more befitting the facts. 'Assured results' there undoubtedly are: the keen criticism of one hundred and eighty years has not been in vain. There is no probability, indeed no possibility, that we shall ever again be able to believe that the Pentateuch came from the hand of Moses or half the Psalter from David. But in other directions confidence in results which were believed to be reasonably certain has been rudely shaken. Deuteronomy, for example, which has been called 'the pivot of Pentateuchal criticism,' and which for over a century has been regarded as a product of the seventh century B.C., has recently

been ascribed by competent scholars both to an earlier and a later period; and with that, much else that was regarded as practically certain will have to be reconsidered.

In this re-orientation of Old Testament criticism, perhaps no one has played a more effective, or at least a more conspicuous, part than Professor C. C. TORREY of Yale University. Besides being an unusually well-equipped Semitic scholar, he has an original and challenging mind. Twenty years ago he presented a very radical treatment of 'Ezra' and the post-exilic period; not long ago in his 'Second Isaiah' he ably argued that that prophecy had nothing to do with Cyrus or the Babylonian Exile, and now he comes forward with a strikingly original—and, to conventional opinion, sufficiently disconcerting—view of the Book of Ezekiel. He presents his case in a volume with the title *Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Original Prophecy* (Milford; 9s. net)—a title which to the initiated will suggest the lines of his argument.

On every page the book is subversive of current critical opinion. Its aim is to prove that 'the original "Ezekiel" was a pseudepigraph purporting to come from the reign of Manasseh, but in fact composed many centuries later. It was converted into a prophecy of the so-called "Babylonian Golah" by an editor who accomplished his undertaking (in all probability) not many years after the original work had appeared.' To be more precise, the original prophecy purported to date from the thirtieth year of Manasseh, that is, from the year 663, while the actual date of its composition is about 230—a date which would explain the atmosphere of the book, which, it is contended, is that of Daniel, Joel, and the last chapters of Zechariah. Its mention of Persia (27<sup>10</sup> 38<sup>5</sup>), which elsewhere is mentioned only in Daniel, Esther, and the Chronicler, ceases to be embarrassing the moment it is recognized that it was composed in the same period as these books.

If the argument be sound, the Book of Ezekiel, instead of coming from the Exile, belongs to the very latest stratum of Old Testament literature;



and the argument is based upon considerations drawn from the historical implications of the book, from its literary relationships, and from its linguistic quality.

The conclusion of the elaborately conducted linguistic argument is that the book is not only late but very late. The language is held to be not only later than the Priestly Code, but to have almost reached the stage illustrated by Daniel, Esther, and Ecclesiastes. The Aramaic element is pervasive. In this connexion Dr. TORREY throws welcome light on the obscure and famous passage 20<sup>25</sup>, of which commentators have usually given singularly unconvincing interpretations. Reminding us that 'in Aramaic, interrogative sentences have commonly no introductory particle,' he treats the sentence rendered 'moreover also I gave them statutes that were not good, and judgments wherein they should not live' as a question, 'Did I at all give them statutes?' etc. To all the questions in vv.<sup>23-26</sup> the answer expected is negative. That, if correct, is a relief.

The literary relationships of the book are also held to point with equal cogency to a late date. It is held to presuppose not only the Holiness Code, but the Priestly Code, and indeed the completed Pentateuch, also the Second Isaiah, which Dr. TORREY places about 400 B.C., and Jeremiah, which he regards as compiled in the middle of the third century. Of peculiar interest is his interpretation of Magog as the Macedonian kingdom, and his interpretation—in this following Nöldeke—of Gog as Alexander the Great, of whom he finds other traces in the Old Testament.

Every careful reader of the Book of Ezekiel has been struck by the fact that many of the appeals and threats addressed, according to the ordinary interpretation of the book, to the exiles, are in reality only relevant in an address directed to the people of Jerusalem and Judah. A certain unreality hangs about this indirect appeal to men separated by hundreds of miles from the speaker. Dr. TORREY explains this by maintaining that the original book had nothing whatever to do with

Babylonia: it dealt 'solely with the Hebrews of Palestine, almost everywhere in the form of direct address.' The allusion on the very threshold of the book to Jehoiachin's captivity is believed by many recent scholars to be an interpolation, and the few—they are astonishingly few—subsequent verses which imply an exilic background are also, according to Dr. TORREY, interpolations. The Judean origin, he argues, 'is sometimes as plain as words can make it, as in 12<sup>19</sup>, 'say unto the people of the land.' The dispersion which the book implies is a dispersion 'among the nations and among the countries' (11<sup>16f.</sup>), but not specifically an exile in Babylon. The prophet's 'dwelling-place' was Jerusalem, and his mission was to the people of the holy land, to warn and rescue those who should listen and repent.'

Dr. TORREY's view, if correct, would also necessitate a drastic revision of the current estimate of the personality of the author. Taking the book as it stands, the writer must be admitted to have had remarkable gifts of a psychic kind. There is more than one instance of clairvoyance, and of prediction with a definiteness which would amount to clairvoyance. In particular Dr. TORREY dwells upon ch. 12 as 'a staggering example of "second sight"'—it is the chapter which portrays in pantomime Zedekiah's flight after the breach in the walls of Jerusalem, and his subsequent blinding before his transportation to Babylon. Ezekiel stands indeed quite alone as a foreteller of future events.

These phenomena have gravely perturbed the commentators. They have driven them to explain Ezekiel as a pathological figure, of a nervous, passionate, excitable temperament, the victim of neurosis, catalepsy, and what not. But this, again, seems strangely inconsistent with the balanced and methodical plan of the book with its 'singularly definite plan and progress.' Dr. TORREY ingeniously cuts the knot by classing it among the pseudepigrapha. Like the Book of Daniel, to which it is akin, and to whose period it more or less belongs, its predictions are really prophecies after the event. Indeed, the book is built directly

upon the story of Manasseh's wicked reign in 2 K 21<sup>2-16</sup>; the idolatries it depicts and denounces are the idolatries of the period of Manasseh, not those of the years that followed the death of Josiah, whose reformation—Dr. TORREY argues in an interesting chapter—was thoroughly successful.

‘The author of the prophecy,’ he says, ‘apparently a man of priestly rank residing in Jerusalem, wished to set before his people, in full detail and with every variety of emphasis, the lesson to be learned from the past, in order that they might be aroused from their present condition of sin and indifference. He had at hand the best possible material for his purpose, in the record of the unexampled wickedness of the Southern Kingdom in the time of Manasseh, and the terrible calamity that had befallen the people. . . . He set himself to imagine what some one of the prophets referred to in 2 K 21<sup>10</sup> would have said in describing the sin of the people and predicting the woes that were impending.’ The view of the book as a third-century pseudepigraph throws light on 38<sup>17</sup>, where the writer looks back upon the closed company of the prophets of old.

Dr. TORREY supports his startling contention with a wealth and subtlety of argument which cannot be ignored, and he has raised a new and unexpected problem for students of the Old Testament.

In his book, *Christ in the Gospels*, Professor B. S. EASTON discusses the results of a careful analysis of Gospel sources. At the close of his inquiry he gives us a chapter entitled ‘Jesus,’ in which he reconstructs in outline the ministry of our Lord, as the sources enable us to see it. Jesus, he says, began His ministry with the Baptist’s proclamation, that the ‘Kingdom of heaven is at hand.’ But this meant that Divine judgment was at hand, and only those who could survive this judgment might hope to enter into the approaching heavenly state.

The apocalyptic promise, therefore, was indis-

solubly bound up with an ethical warning, and those unready to face the coming sifting are bidden to repent. Yet a demand for repentance is meaningless until given concrete content, and so the apocalypticist is necessarily an ethical prophet as well. It is in this way that, for example, the Parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins and the Sermon on the Mount are integral parts of the same message. Yet the apocalyptic element did not intrude into the ethical so as to distort it. It did not become an interim ethic, a series of emergency rules for the brief time that this earth will continue. When Jesus said, ‘Be not anxious for your life,’ the motive given is not the nearness of the Kingdom when all human lives cease, but God’s unfailing care for the birds and the flowers. There are many other examples of the same thing.

How did Jesus know this truth that He taught? We cannot clearly say. So far as He was concerned, what He said was final and inerrant, ‘I say unto you.’ But we can guess so far that it came to Him through His own experience. The consciousness of God’s universal Fatherhood came to Him through His own vivid sense of God’s Fatherhood in relation to Himself. None the less, it remains strange that He kept silence till His thirtieth year. Why? Probably because He was not quite sure as to His commission or the authority with which He could speak. Perhaps the confirmation came to Him with the Baptist’s preaching. He must have recognized many of the Baptist’s thoughts as His own. The way was now open for the Messiah when John had come preparing a people for the Lord. And Jesus came forth from the baptismal water unshakably conscious that He Himself was the Messiah. All the intimations of His past life were now explained.

From the beginning the apocalyptic message was present. But the ethical message was not defined by that. At the most the approach of the world catastrophe gave an added solemnity to warnings that were perpetually valid. We must think, then, of Jesus’ teaching at the opening of His ministry to be such as we find in the Sermon on the Mount with a background of somewhat general



apocalyptic warnings, such as the Parables of the Talents and the Virgins, all pervaded by Jesus' doctrine of forgiveness based on the Fatherhood of God.

It is this apocalyptic element, however, that shows us that Jesus was conscious of being more than a mere reformer of the current misinterpretations of the Law. He was aware that part of His teaching was wholly new. This was the result of the apocalyptic hope. What the Baptist had initiated He was carrying on to completion. His power, shown in the healing acts, was nothing less than the first workings on earth of the coming Kingdom. It was from this conviction, based on His experience, that Jesus developed the second part of what we may call His 'double soteriology.' He Himself and the Kingdom were inseparable. And so He could bring His disciples within its present influence. His life of sonship and His Messiahship were the two parts of His saving power. 'All things have been delivered to me by my Father.' The Kingdom was already victorious, the Father's love was already transforming men, in Himself.

Jesus knew what all this involved for Himself—an early death. And with this fatal prospect in sight His conception of the Messiahship reached its fullest development. The work of the Messiah could not possibly fail. Death, therefore, would not interfere with Jesus' personal completion of His appointed task. If success in this world was

incomplete He must look for His final victory beyond this world. And since death would exalt Him out of this world into heaven, the final Messianic achievement would be from heaven. So from this point onward 'Son of Man' appears as a self-designation of Jesus. And it is obvious that to Jesus His death had a definite redemptive significance. It was vital to God's plan of salvation. Only by violating everything we know about Jesus can we conceive that He did not think of His body as given for human beings, or of His blood as poured out for many.

Were the disciples plunged into despair by their Master's death? In some cases, doubtless. But this can hardly be true of them all. For Jesus had fully prepared them for it. He had shown them that it was a necessity, and that it would only transfer His Messianic work from earth to heaven. He had gone to the Father, and in a few years He would return as the glorious Son of Man. And to preach His doctrine and Himself as the Messiah was their urgent duty. But, as a matter of fact, far more than this was to be their message, when they knew that He had risen from the dead. And the doctrine of an enduring relation between heaven and earth through the Son of Man, which was now proclaimed, was a wholly novel thing. At this point Messianism ceases and Christology begins. The visions of the risen Christ were visions of reality, and those who throughout the centuries have shared the faith of the disciples have found themselves in contact with the same source of power and life.

## National Contributions to Biblical Science.

### VII. The Contribution of France to Old Testament Science.

BY THE REVEREND DR. ARTHUR R. SIEBENS, OHIO.

In the history of Old Testament criticism the appearance of the *Conjectures sur la Genèse* in 1753 by the French physician, Astruc, marks the dawn of a new era. Thus it has become customary to divide the course that Old Testament study has

taken into two periods, that preceding Astruc and that following him.

And yet, strangely enough, the advent of the *Conjectures*, while marking a new beginning in international criticism, constitutes a climax in the



study of the Old Testament in France. For, contrary to the impression given by many a biographer of Astruc, the famous work of the versatile Frenchman did not spring forth out of season, as though without parent or ancestor, but constitutes a culmination of investigation by Jew, Catholic, and Protestant within the confines of the area now known as France. Long before the modern era of active criticism in Germany and Britain began, the French had passed through a cycle of study which was as daring for its epoch as it is fascinating in retrospect.

#### EARLY STUDY OF HEBREW.

Obviously, true criticism could not begin among Occidentals until the Old Testament had been brought to Western peoples in its original language and until Western scholars had obtained some knowledge of the original tongue. The most useful scholars in bringing this knowledge to French soil were the Jews, Joseph Kimhi and his sons, Moses and David, who lived in the southern city of Narbonne in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Hitherto, criticism in France was best typified by the traditionalists, such as Moses ha-Darshan of Narbonne and the school founded in northern France by the great commentator, Rashi (1040-1105). This school was not without merit, for it modified or opposed the interpretations of the Midrash and sought the self-evident meaning by the use of 'common sense,' but it did not supplement this method by research into the Hebrew language or by other scientific study. Yet, Rashi's influence was considerable even outside of France and outside of Jewish circles. The French monk, Nicolas de Lyre (c. 1265-1349), in his *Postillae Perpetuae*, depended chiefly on the Jew's commentaries, and years later the work of Nicolas in turn exerted a powerful influence on Martin Luther.

When the elder Kimhi removed from his native Spain to Narbonne, he brought with him the results of Jewish philological study which had hitherto been confined almost entirely to those versed in Arabic. He published what was at once the first Hebrew grammar in Hebrew and the first work in the Hebrew language in Christian countries (c. 1150-1170). He is also credited with being the first to divide the Hebrew vowels into two classifications, the long and the short. The son, Moses, went a step farther and wrote an introduction to the study of Hebrew with rules and many paradigms, and introduced the now common sequence in the enumeration of Hebrew stem-forms. The second son, David (c. 1160-1235), wrote a commentary on

Genesis in which he follows his contemporary, the Spanish rabbi, Maimonides (1135-1204), in explaining the Biblical narratives as visions. The first printed texts of the Hebrew Bible were accompanied by this commentary.

The influence of the Kimhis was far-reaching. Johann Reuchlin, the humanist who, in 1506, published the first work of consequence by a Christian on Hebrew grammar, took much of the material for his *Rudimenta Linguae Hebraicae* from David Kimhi's *Miklol*.

One can hardly pass from the Kimhi family to the next epoch in criticism without referring to another Sephardic Jew, Ibn Ezra, who must have exerted a considerable influence in France. Fleeing from Spain he visited Narbonne, the home of Kimhi, in 1139, and again in 1160. In 1155 he visited Béziers, where he wrote a book on the names of God. Several of his exegetical works were completed in the town of Dreux in northern France. Commentaries by Moses Kimhi on Proverbs and Ezra have been erroneously ascribed to Ibn Ezra, but there can be no doubt that the great travelling scholar exerted an influence in French circles which in turn redounded to the good of the entire field of criticism.

Again, during the centuries when Europe was struggling for release from mediævalism and preparing for the Reformation, there was little progress in Biblical Criticism, but the work of Moses Kimhi on the study of Hebrew did not perish, and in 1508 the German Jewish grammarian, Elias Levita (1469-1549), wrote a commentary on it, and the combined work became the basis for the study of Hebrew among many non-Jewish scholars.

#### THE REFORMATION PERIOD.

During the great reform movements of the sixteenth century little was accomplished in Biblical Criticism in Catholic circles. There were men like Franciscus Vatablus (?-1547), Professor of Hebrew in Paris, but he was embarrassed by those of his Church when he undertook to lecture on the Old Testament, and his *Annotationes in Vet. Test.* (1545) contain nothing of special note. Then there was the Dominican scholar, Sanctus Pagninus, who made a Latin translation of the Bible (Lyons, 1527), the first to appear since the Vulgate. But the translation was so literal that it was of limited practical use. His *Institutionem Hebraicarum* (Lyons, 1526) relied entirely on the Kimhis and other rabbis.

Among Protestants the study of Hebrew and the investigation of the Old Testament during the



Reformation seems to have proceeded more freely. As in Germany Luther, so in France Calvin was the leader in Bible study. Calvin's knowledge of Hebrew was not comprehensive, but his commentaries show that he delved carefully into the actual sense of difficult passages. Of his works his commentaries on the Psalms are perhaps the best. He manifested an unusual degree of impartiality when he ruled that many of the Psalms which had been considered as clearly Messianic really referred to events and persons much nearer to the author's time.

In his commentary on Genesis, Calvin warmly defended the book against those who questioned its historical character. Other works on the Old Testament by Calvin are the commentaries on Isaiah and Joshua, in which he maintains a conservative position, and expositions regarding other prophets which were published by his followers.

#### NEW FOUNDATIONS—CAPPEL.

Old Testament criticism in French Christian circles does not really begin until after the Reformation, through the activity of the Protestant theologians, Jacques Cappel (1570-1624) and his brother Louis (1585-1658). After having been taught in their chosen field by his older brother, Louis travelled in England, Holland, and Germany; and for two years studied Semitic languages at Oxford. Upon his return to France he was called to the Protestant Seminary at Saumur to teach Hebrew and theology. Much of his lifetime was devoted to combating the theory, supported by the Buxtorfs and a host of others, that the Hebrew vowel points are as old as the Scriptures themselves. He produced two notable works on this subject, *Arcanum punctuationis revelatum, sive diatriba de punctorum vocalium et accentuum apud Hebraeos vera et genuina antiquitate* (Leyden, 1624) and *Critica sacra sive de variis quae in sacris V. T. libris occurrunt lectionibus lib. VI, subjecta est quaestio de locis parallelis V. et N.T.* (Paris, 1650). In the earlier of these Cappel showed that the vowel points are not of Divine origin, but that the Massoretes invented them in about the sixth century. In the second he lays the foundation for the textual criticism of the Bible, when he shows that the text has often been changed and is in many places corrupt, but that in many instances the original can be re-established by scientific methods. Although Elias Levita had entertained views of a similar nature (also Ibn Ezra, 12th cent., and Natroni ben Hilai, 9th cent.), it was Louis Cappel who did much to formulate and introduce them in Christian circles. So audacious did Cappel's

opinions seem to his contemporaries that no printer in France, Holland, or Switzerland would publish the work; and it would probably have passed into oblivion if his son, who had turned Catholic, had not aided in obtaining a special royal permit for its publication.

It has been said of Cappel's *Critica Sacra* that it was 'the real beginning of textual criticism in the Christian Church' (so J. F. McCurdy in *Jewish Enc.*, iii. 175). We must not be surprised to learn, therefore, that Cappel has been regarded as 'le père de la critique biblique.' It is true that in 1633 the Catholic priest, Jean Morin, assailed the integrity of the Hebrew text in his *Exercitationes Biblicae*, but the bitterness of the author toward Jew and Protestant rendered the work of little critical value.

#### PEYRÈRE.

In the seventeenth century we also encounter the fantastic writings of Isaac Peyrère (1594-1676). This scholar was originally a French Reformed divine, and later became a Catholic. Peyrère held that Adam was the ancestor, not of the entire human race, but of Israel only. Many other peoples, such as the Egyptians, Chinese, etc., were created before Israel. The deluge covered only Judah. Pagan nations who had not received the Law never sinned. The titles of these extraordinary treatises by Peyrère are worth noting, *Praeadamitae sive exercitatio super versibus 12, 13 et 14, capituli V. Epistolae D. Pauli ad Romanos, quibus indicantur primi homines ante Adamum conditi*, Paris, 1655; and *Systema theologicum ex praeadamitarum hypothesi*. The latter work was condemned to be burned in 1656.

Peyrère denied the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, but held that these books were compiled from diaries or autographs which Moses had compiled. These were lost, and our Pentateuch represents an attempt to make abstracts of them at a much later date.

When he joined the Catholic Church, Peyrère recanted his 'erreurs détestables' and also his Calvinism after having been arrested at Brussels and brought to Rome. Though arbitrary in many of his views, Peyrère made a stimulating contribution to Old Testament criticism, especially in those passages of his *Systema theologicum* where he treats of the origin of the Pentateuch.

#### BOCHART.

Another French scholar who exerted a considerable influence in his day but who is often overlooked



is Samuel Bochart (1599-1667), a Protestant minister at Caen. He sought to organize and systematize the genealogies of the Biblical peoples, and also made a study of the geography and zoology of the Bible. His reputation led the Swedish queen, Christina, to call him to Stockholm, where he spent one year. While in no sense a critic of the Hebrew text or of Biblical history, Bochart's works, *Geographica Sacra* (Caen, 1646) and *Hierozoicon s. de Animalibus* (London, 1663), were unique and helpful in their day.

#### SIMON, THE FORERUNNER.

We come now to the better-known Richard Simon (1638-1712), a priest attached to the Congregation of the Oratoire in Paris and author of the famous *Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament*. All arrangements had been made for the publication of this manuscript, when a copy of the table of contents fell into the hands of that guardian of orthodoxy, Bossuet. It seems that Simon's secret purpose in this book was to undermine the confidence of Protestants in the Bible as the final rule of faith, by demonstrating the human nature of its origin. But, if this was Simon's purpose, Catholic ecclesiasts failed to appreciate the effort, for they decried the book as 'a mass of impiety and libertinage.' Simon was accused of having substituted 'le sens humain au sens de Dieu.' When the work was nearly ready for distribution, 1300 copies were seized by de la Reynie, chief of police in Paris, and burned. Several editions were later published in foreign lands, in French, Latin, and English. Of the editions in French the one of 1685 (Rotterdam, chez Leers) is the best.

The exotic editions of Simon's book are not difficult to find, but the copies of the first edition, which was confiscated in Paris, are scarce indeed. Nevertheless, the Bibliothèque Mazarine in Paris possesses a well-worn copy of the historic edition of 1678. It is without frontispiece or other preliminary pages. On the inside cover one finds these words written by hand and signed 'Brunet': — 'Edition originale, devenue très rare parcequ'elle a été saisie chez l'imprimeur par ordre du chancelier avant qu'elle fut entièrement imprimée, presque tous les exemplaires ont été détruits . . .'<sup>1</sup> An

English translation appeared in London in 1682. It contains a poem dedicated to the unidentified translator (probably the unfortunate scholar, John Hampden) which reflects ominously sentiments concerning Simon's views and their introduction into English circles:

What senseless loads have overcharg'd the Press  
Of French impertinence in English dress?

How many dull Translatours every day  
Bring new supplies of Novel, Farce or Play?  
Like damn'd French Pensioners, with foreign aid,  
Their native land with nonsense to invade;  
Till we're o'er-run more with the Wit of France,  
Her nauseous Wit, than with her Protestants.

Simon's contribution lies in his expansion of the principle of criticism from the textual to the literary and the historical. Yet he studied the text diligently and utilized *all* the versions. He denies that Moses or any other single author wrote our Pentateuch. He insists that, if one author had written the story of the Creation or the Flood, he would have made it more clear and harmonious. He holds that our narrative has been made up from annals prepared by public writers or historians. This theory had been proposed before his day, namely, by the Belgian orientalist, Maes (Masius). In fact, R. Simon proposed little that was new in substance, but he sought to harmonize and collate the views of other critical scholars. In doing this, however, he also attacked with vigour and laid himself open to spirited criticism of which the burning of the *Histoire Critique* was the direct result. Beyond the confines of France also he was criticised, for in Holland Jean Leclerc penned his *Sentimens* (of which more below) against the Oratorien.

Simon died almost without friends and without pupils, for so bitter were the attacks against him in Catholic circles, that others dared not come to his aid. His immediate influence was small, but his permanent influence was considerable. His style is clear and reflects a lucidity of mind and a courage unknown in Catholic circles of his day. Those who persecuted him are guilty of an inexcusable intolerance. Says Renan concerning them,

xx. 698; and in the *Jewish Enc.*, vol. xi. 374. There is also a well-guarded copy in the *Bibliothèque Nationale* in Paris,<sup>2</sup> and another in the British Museum. E. M'Queen, Gray (*Old Testament Criticism*, New York, 1923, pp. 245-6) enumerates six copies that escaped the flames, without including the one the present writer consulted in Paris. The number would thus be increased to a perfect '7.'

<sup>1</sup> The existence of this copy, among others, and the above statement that *presque tous* ('nearly all') the copies of the first edition were burned, prove that some were saved. It is therefore incorrect to state that the entire edition of 1678 was destroyed, as is done in the *Grande Encyclopédie*, Paris, vol. xxx. 46; *Enc. Brit.*, 11th ed., vol. xxv. 131, and 14th ed., vol.



'Bossuet, assisté par la Reynie, tua les études bibliques en France pour plusieurs générations. Bientôt, la révocation de l'édit de Nantes enleva le seul aiguillon qui donnât encore quelque activité scientifique au clergé catholique . . . ' (from preface to Pierson's trans. of Kuenen, *Histoire Critique*, p. xiii).

But throughout his lifetime Simon protested that he was perfectly orthodox. In spite of expulsion from the congregation of the Oratoire and in spite of relentless persecution, he died in the faith of his Church.

#### LECLERC AND HIS 'SENTIMENTS.'

We have already made mention of Jean Leclerc (1656-1736) and his opposition to Simon. Clericus was born in Geneva of a French family. He was a Protestant theologian who, after tutoring and studying in Paris, Saumur, and Grenoble, settled in Amsterdam where he served first as a preacher and then as a Professor of Philosophy and Hebrew in the Remonstrant Seminary. While there Leclerc published his *Sentimens de quelques théologiens de Hollande sur l'Histoire critique de V. T. composée par R. Simon*, 1685. Simon replied in 1686, and Leclerc wrote a defence of his 'sentiments' during the same year, to which Simon wrote a second 'Réponse' in 1687.

One would expect the exchange of views of these two scholars to furnish exciting reading, but on the essential point of Mosaic authorship the two agree, and a large portion of the letters is given over to what is little more than quibbling. Simon's arguments especially are often marked by personal references to Leclerc that are little short of insult. Nevertheless the exchange of 'sentiments' brings out clearly the incisiveness of the authors' minds.

One of the unique theories advocated by Leclerc is that the Pentateuch was written by a priest sent by the king of Assyria to Samaria to teach the people (2 K 17<sup>27, 28</sup>). But Leclerc's critical views are for the most part sound, and his method is the one to which the modern school of criticism owes much of its success—the historical method. In fact, Leclerc's *Sentimens* contains a well-conceived table of passages with comments based on arguments from history upon which he rests his conclusion that the Pentateuch must have been composed later than Mosaic times.

One of the strangest episodes in all Biblical Criticism is connected with Leclerc. After his epic dispute with Simon, and after having undertaken his exegetical works on all the canonical books of the Old Testament, Leclerc changes his

position with reference to many points, especially regarding the authorship of the Pentateuch, and concludes that Moses is the author, though later interpolations have been made (cf. his *De scriptore Pentateuchi Mose*). What may have been the conditions that led to the reversal will always be a matter of conjecture, but Leclerc's writings will remain one of the rich legacies in the field of Old Testament criticism.

With Simon and Leclerc criticism in the period before Astruc reached its zenith. From their day to the appearance of Astruc there were few scholars of note. There was the Benedictine, Dom Antoine Calmet (1672-1757), who produced a *Commentaire littéral sur la Bible* (1707-1716) in twenty-three volumes, and other writings. But these cannot bear the test of modern scholarship. Richard Simon criticised them vigorously. Of interest also is the able orientalist, Etienne Fourmont (1683-1745). He was expelled from the Catholic 'Seminary of the Thirty-three' because he had read forbidden Greek and Latin works, but he pressed his study of Hebrew (also Syriac and Chinese) with ardour and composed a *Nouvelle Critique sacrée*. He also entered into a spirited polemic against Calmet regarding his commentary on Genesis, without, however, proposing anything essentially new concerning the Old Testament. Later he composed a *Grammaire Hébraïque* and an important work in two volumes entitled *Réflexions critiques sur les histoires des anciens peuples*, 1735.

#### ASTRUC AND THE NEW ERA.

Whence came this man whose impress is still so plainly felt in scientific circles? The father of Jean Astruc (1684-1766) was a Protestant minister in France who, upon the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, turned Catholic. The son studied medicine and became a physician of note. He was court physician to Louis xv., and was the author of several important medical works.

Study of the Bible was for Astruc an avocation, and before publishing his epoch-making book, he sought the advice of friends as to its propriety. After receiving encouragement for his project he published his work anonymously in Brussels in 1753, ten years after it had been first prepared, under the title *Conjectures sur les mémoires originaux dont il paroît que Moïse s'est servi pour composer le livre de la Genèse*. The extreme timidity of Astruc in this matter is reflected in the preface, where he states that if those who are authorized to decide the matter should find his conclusions false he is ready to abandon them.



Contrary to what is believed by many to be the case, Astruc did not set out to deny the Mosaic authorship of Genesis. Rather, he desired to defend Mosaic authorship and to show whence the materials or 'memoirs' which Moses used came originally. Moses, says Astruc in his preliminary reflections, could not have known the facts reported in Genesis 'first-hand,' for he was too far removed from the events recorded. Consequently, he must have possessed other records. Astruc then cites the doublets in the narratives, the alternate use of the Divine names, and the reversals of chronological order, and concludes that Moses must have used two main documents as sources, one employing the name, Elohîm, in designating God, and the other, the Tetragrammaton. He further identifies ten other sources or documents. All of these were first written in parallel columns, but in recopying them the scribe confused them, and the present Genesis is the result.

Thus simply may the essential elements of Astruc's theory be recounted.<sup>1</sup> Their genius lies in the fact that they offer a specific hypothesis which has at the same time been applied in written form. Modern criticism does not, like Astruc, credit Moses with being the redactor, but it follows the method of Astruc to a remarkable degree.

In France, Astruc's opinions did not arouse the opposition that was expected. The author was not severely attacked, and his book was not placed on the index. (Astruc was painstakingly 'orthodox' on other questions.) At the same time there were no immediate enthusiasts to develop his ideas in France.<sup>2</sup> It was rather in the freer atmosphere of Germany that the plant whose roots had first been sent forth in France could grow. Thus, strangely enough, the modern critical school developed in Germany, first slowly, then by leaps and bounds, and later captured England, while there was, for a time, comparative inactivity in France.

#### FURTHER ADVANCES.

It was an Alsatian of German origin, Edward Reuss (1804-1891), for sixty years a professor at

<sup>1</sup> Adolphe Lods, Professor at the University of Paris, has shown that the general conclusions of Astruc were set forth at an earlier date (1711), in a work by H. B. Witter, a German pastor at Hildesheim. But the book seems to have gone unnoticed by the earlier critics. Cf. *Zeitschrift f. d. A'test. Wissenschaft*, xlv. 134-5.

<sup>2</sup> On the reception of Astruc's *Conjectures*, cf. the excellent work by Adolphe Lods of Paris, *Jean Astruc et la Critique Biblique au XVIIIe Siècle*, 1924, pp. 63-71.

Strassburg, who published the outstanding critical works in the French language during the earlier period of modern critical study. We may cite especially his complete translation of the Bible into French with commentaries, in sixteen volumes (1875-91). Reuss was the teacher of Graf, and it was Reuss who, in his lectures, proposed the sequence JE, D, P long before either he himself or Graf published their conclusions on this point.

A résumé of French criticism during this period would not be complete without a word concerning Ernest Renan (1823-1892). He broke from the restraining influence of the priesthood and became the hunted enemy of the Church. His mission to Phœnicia in 1860 was due to a compromise. Renan was the logical successor to Quatremère, Professor of Hebrew and Chaldaic in the Collège de France, but the Catholic party opposed his appointment. Consequently, the mission to Phœnicia was proposed by the emperor, and Renan accepted. The Phœnician inscriptions thus obtained form the basis for the famous *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*. Upon his return in 1862 he was finally appointed to the desired chair at the Collège, but two years later his enemies brought about his dismissal. Thenceforward Renan devoted his time to writing, but he was embittered by his trials. His *Histoire d'Israel* was begun at the age of sixty. While not always reliable in detail, this work is of great importance in Old Testament criticism, because it recognizes the evolution and progress of religious ideas.

#### RESTRAINING INFLUENCES.

In modern as in earlier times French contributions to Old Testament criticism have been limited by the position of the Catholic Church regarding critical study. During the modern rise of the Graf-Wellhausen school a French Catholic orientalist, François Lenormant, produced a work entitled *Origines de l'Histoire d'après la Bible et les traditions des peuples Orientaux* (1880-1884). In the preface to this work the author accepts the 'documentary' hypothesis concerning the origin of the Pentateuch and pleads for liberty for the critic. But on December 19, 1887, Lenormant's work was placed on the Index.

In the autumn of 1892, at the opening of the *Institut Catholique* in Paris, the Professor of Sacred Scripture, Alfred Loisy by name, made a plea in his inaugural lecture for freedom in the study of the 'human' side of the Bible (printed in *Les études bibliques*, 1894). Loisy continued to teach and uphold the critical theory. In January 1893,



Mgr. d'Hulst, rector of the Institute, published an article in the *Correspondant* in which he showed a sympathetic attitude toward the critical view, but in November of the same year Pope Leo XIII. issued an encyclical entitled *Providentissimus Deus* in which the absolute inerrancy of the Bible was regarded as a corollary of its inspiration.

Four years later M.-J. Lagrange, superior of the Dominican School for Biblical Research in Jerusalem, read a paper before the Catholic Scientific Congress at Friburg in which he defended a liberal attitude toward the critical view. Finally, in 1902, Leo XIII. issued an apostolic letter, 'Vigilantiae,' establishing the Biblical Commission. This commission has modified the position previously held by two of the scholars indicated, for, on June 27, 1906, it ruled that the Pentateuch is substantially the work of Moses. But nothing can modify the fire of a personality like Loisy's, and, in 1908, while in the midst of his critical study of the New Testament, the now famous scholar was excommunicated.<sup>1</sup>

#### RECENT PROTESTANT CRITICISM.

In French Protestant circles (there are less than a million Protestants in France proper out of a population of about forty millions) research work has never ceased, and to-day the critical view is quite generally accepted. Beyond doubt the scholar who did most to introduce the modern 'critical' position regarding the Old Testament in France is Alexandre Westphal (b. 1861). After a brilliant scholastic career in his native land, he studied and travelled extensively in Germany and the Holy Land.

Westphal is one of the few living scholars who knew and corresponded with the old masters, such as Wellhausen. He belongs to the moderately critical or right wing of Old Testament criticism. His life has been devoted to teaching in Montpellier and Paris, preaching at Vauvert, Lausanne, and Paris, and writing all the while. His first important works were his *Deutéronome* (Toulouse, 1891), and the well-known *Sources du Pentateuch* (2 vols., Paris, 1888-92). Later there appeared *Jéhovah ou les étapes de la révélation du peuple d'Israël* (1903), *Les Prophètes* (Paris, 1924), and numerous other works covering the entire Bible. His devoutness and his unquestioned scholarship have resulted,

two years ago, in the confiding to him of the editing of the French *Dictionnaire Encyclopédique*, of which the first volume is in the press as these lines are being written.

The outstanding active Hebrew scholar and teacher in Protestant circles to-day is Adolphe Lods. This keen-minded critic teaches both at the *Faculté des Lettres* of the University of Paris and at the *École des Hautes Études*. Other present-day French scholars in the Old Testament field include the Brustons, father and son, at the Protestant Seminary at Montpellier, and A. Causse and C. Jean at Strassburg.

#### FRENCH ARCHÆOLOGISTS.

In addition to the direct contributions to Old Testament criticism which we have enumerated above, there are others of almost equal brilliance which have been made in the field of archæology and the cognate languages. Space permits the mere mention of only a few of these. First, there was the discovery on the banks of the Nile of the Rosetta Stone by the French officer, Boussard, in 1799. It was real genius that led another Frenchman, the Egyptologist, Champollion, to discover the key to the hieroglyphic writing and thus open the door to that epoch of history which could pour so great light on the study of the Israelites.

Then there was the French vice-consul, P. E. Botta, who in 1842 gave fresh impulse to the study of the Near East by his discovery at Khorsabad of a huge palace covering twenty-five acres. The edifice proved to be that of Sargon II. (722-705 B.C.), whose name was until that time known only through the reference in Is 20<sup>1</sup>. Five volumes, with 400 plates, entitled *Monuments de Ninive*, 1849-50, tell the story of Botta's work.

In 1868, a German missionary, F. A. Klein discovered near Diban a stone having inscriptions. As a result of international rivalry in obtaining possession of the relic, the Arabs, fearing to lose such a prize, broke it (by building a fire under it, then pouring water on it) and distributed it for charms and relics. Thereupon M. Clermont-Ganneau, the French orientalist, succeeded in re-discovering and assembling nearly all of the broken pieces. The result is that to-day the invaluable stone of Mesha, King of Moab (c. 850 B.C.), stands in the Louvre together with a 'squeeze' or paper impression of the stone made by the French while it was still intact.

The most startling discovery was yet to be made. In 1884-86 Jacques de Morgan began excavating on the mound of ancient Susa. His discovery of

<sup>1</sup> Intolerance has, however, not been altogether confined to Catholic circles in so far as O.T. criticism is concerned. Witness the trials of W. Robertson Smith in England and of C. A. Briggs and H. G. Mitchell in the U.S.

a Persian palace was in itself significant, but in 1900-1902 a second expedition to the same mound was undertaken. This time there was discovered that most valuable of all relics for the study of the Old Testament, the stele of Hammurabi, the king who reigned in Babylon about 2000 B.C. Inscribed on the stele in cuneiform were 240 or more laws which offered a basis of comparison between Biblical laws and those of the other peoples of the ancient Orient, thus ushering in a new era in the study of the Hebrew codes.

Accompanying de Morgan on this mission was the Assyriologist, Père Scheil. In an incredibly short time the genial and indefatigable scholar, now with the University of Paris, had published an excellent translation of the code.

Once more in recent years France made Old Testament scholars indebted to her when the archæological expedition which went to Syria in

1921 unearthed a new-ancient city at Byblos (in the shadow of the mount on which Renan wrote his *Vie de Jésus*). The greatest treasure this time was the tomb of Akhiram, on which was an inscription in Phœnician characters which is the oldest yet discovered. It dates from the thirteenth century or about the time of Moses.

Every one of the major archæological discoveries which have shed light on the Old Testament has been contributed to the world by France.

And thus we bring to a close this brief review of the brilliant course of French scholarship in Old Testament research. A fine intuitiveness, combined with courage, indefatigable energy, and a wholesome curiosity concerning the unknown—these have characterized the study of the Old Testament by the French. What a debt enlightened scholarship owes to them!

## Mary Magdalene and Mary, Sister of Martha.

By PROFESSOR F. C. BURKITT, D.D., CAMBRIDGE.

ONE of the oldest differences between East and West is as to whether Mary Magdalene and Mary, the sister of Martha, are two persons or the same person. The Eastern view is that they are different; the Western view, as attested by the Roman services for July 22nd, is that they are the same, and, further, that the same Mary was the unnamed 'sinful woman' of Lk 7<sup>36-50</sup>. The objection to the Western (or Roman) view is that neither in S. Luke nor in S. John does Mary, Martha's sister, give the impression of a once notorious but now repentant sinner. The objection to the Eastern view is that we seem to be compelled by the evangelical details to acknowledge the identity of the sister of Lazarus with the woman who anointed Jesus at Simon's supper, and also the identity of this woman with the 'sinful woman' of S. Luke's Gospel, who is further supposed to be the Mary Magdalene from whom seven devils had gone out.

The two different views, it is interesting to remember, are represented in the extant forms of Tatian's 'Diatessaron.' In the Arabic, with which Ephraim in this matter seems to agree, the 'sinful woman' is separated from the supper at Bethany; in Cod. Fuldensis and the Dutch Harmonies the two accounts are run together.

Historical problems of this kind used to be studied on the supposition that the four Gospels were of equal authority and equally accurate. This has now been succeeded by very different suppositions. There is general agreement that Mark was a principal source for Matthew and Luke, and a good deal of what we read in John is now regarded as adaptation by the Evangelist rather than objective history. That is to say, such statements or 'concessions' are often made when 'the Synoptic Problem' or 'the composition of the Fourth Gospel' is the subject of discussion. But if these literary conclusions are sound they should be acknowledged when purely historical questions are discussed, in questions of historical reconstruction. How does the question of Mary Magdalene appear, when viewed with modern critical pre-suppositions?

Beginning with Mark, we only read of Mary Magdalene—*Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή*, Mary of (?) Magdala—as one of the women who watched the Crucifixion to the end, who saw the hasty burial, and on the Sunday morning found the body of Jesus gone. We further read of a supper at Bethany at the house of one 'Simon the Leper,' apparently on the day before the Last Supper, at which an



unnamed woman anointed the head of Jesus with 'pistic nard.' It cost three hundred pence, but Jesus accepted the homage as a sort of anticipatory funeral honour. It is a curious incident, and the exact meaning of 'pistic nard' appears to be forgotten, but the remark of Jesus about burial accords with the last week and with that alone. Who 'Simon the Leper' may have been does not appear. There is no word in the tale to suggest that the woman was not virtuous.

The Gospel of Matthew follows Mark exactly, so far as we are now concerned. It adds a direct vision of Jesus to the women, immediately following after our Mark has left off, but Mary Magdalene is not explicitly named or characterized in it.<sup>1</sup>

Luke brings in new accounts. He leaves out the supper at Bethany and only mentions Mary Magdalene once (24<sup>10</sup>) at the end. On the other hand, he tells us in 8<sup>1-2</sup> that Mary Magdalene was one of those whom Jesus had healed of 'evil spirits and weaknesses,' in fact 'seven demons had gone out from her' (8<sup>2</sup>): she was one of those who had travelled about with Jesus and the disciples in Galilee, and helped to maintain them. This account seems to rest on good historical information: names like 'Johana wife of Chuza, Herod's steward,' look more like reminiscence than myth. But valuable as the information is, it does not go very far. It is useless to speculate on the nature of the 'seven demons': does it mean a very severe visitation of some kind, or recurring attacks of fits or epilepsy? We cannot tell. But in any case it is not very likely that Johana the wife of Chuza would be travelling about Galilee with a notorious courtesan. There is nothing whatever in Lk 8<sup>1-3</sup> to suggest that the Mary Magdalene there mentioned was anything but a respectable invalid.<sup>2</sup>

We come now to Lk 7<sup>36-50</sup>, the story of the 'sinful woman.' The first thing that may be remarked about it is that there is every reason to dissociate this woman from the Mary Magdalene mentioned in 8<sup>2</sup>. In 8<sup>2</sup> the Evangelist introduces Mary Magdalene to us as a new personage, and, further, the 'sinful woman' in 7<sup>50</sup> is dismissed.

<sup>1</sup> I take no account here of the Appendix to the genuine Mark (16<sup>9-20</sup>), which is uncritically compiled out of the other Gospels.

<sup>2</sup> In this conclusion I rejoice to have the support of one very diligent reader of theological literature: 'Well, you know,' said Lady Palmerston, 'people used to abuse Melbourne because he said Mary Magdalene was not near so bad as she was represented' (Guedalla, *Palmerston*, 388).

Even if the two women were the same person, we may say that the Evangelist has gone out of his way to put them before us as two.

Is the story, as Luke tells it, credible? Yes, and No. The main tale is, I suppose, credible enough, but I cannot help feeling that the Evangelist has cut it about somewhat in the process of taking it out of its original context and inserting it in his Gospel. If the Pharisee invited Jesus to a meal, why did he not receive his Guest with a kiss, and with the usual opportunity for ablutions (vv.<sup>44-46</sup>)? As a rule with 'Pharisees' it was the other way (Lk 11<sup>38</sup>). Very likely it would have taken too much space to explain the situation; the Evangelist had his eye on the main moral, and was not concerned with Simon the Pharisee, etc. All this is justifiable, but there remains a feeling that the *mise-en-scène* is not explained, that something has been altered by Luke. Perhaps at the same time he has taken the opportunity of adding a touch or two from another scene of anointing at another supper, which then he will not need to reproduce. If we must take all the details as they stand, there is some resemblance between the two suppers, and therefore between the women who anoint: perhaps in Luke's source there was no resemblance whatever.

Next, we come to Lk 10<sup>37-42</sup>, the story of how a certain woman by name Martha received Jesus. She had a sister called Mary, who preferred staying and listening to Jesus to helping her sister with getting the meal ready. There is nothing to indicate the place or the time: were it not for what we read in the Fourth Gospel it would surely never have occurred to any one to suppose that the sisters lived just outside Jerusalem. Still less does it seem likely that this Mary was identical with the Mary Magdalene of Lk 8<sup>2</sup> or the 'sinful woman' of Lk 7<sup>37-50</sup>.

Let us collect at this point the results obtained. We learn that the Mary Magdalene who visited the grave of Jesus was a Galilean disciple of some property, who had been cured by Jesus from a severe, perhaps recurrent, complaint, and that there is no reason to suppose that her morals had been irregular. We have a story of a pair of sisters, Martha and Mary, who seem to have lived in Galilee. And further, we learn that there were current two different stories of a meal at which a woman brought a special box of unguents for Jesus: in the one case it is in the last week, in the other the special point of the story is that the woman was a notorious bad character. Further, there is some reason to guess that features from the first story have been imported into the second, as we

have it, there are two Maries, not one Mary, two anointings, and not one anointing; but neither Mary is connected with any story of anointing.

Now we come to the Fourth Gospel. Let us confess that we do not come unprejudiced. That is to say, we come knowing that much of the dialogue in that work can only be regarded as the free composition of the writer, that the whole presentation of the story is bound up with theological rather than historical views, and that in particular the whole story of the Raising of Lazarus cannot be harmonized with the course of events sketched in Mark. I am not attempting to prove these statements: they are not new, and are to be found in almost any modern discussion of the Fourth Gospel. But granting their general correctness, what then? Surely this, that no historical statement made in the Fourth Gospel, and there alone, is of sufficient weight to disturb an otherwise probable conclusion in the story of the ministry of Jesus.

The Fourth Gospel<sup>1</sup> has the pair of sisters, Martha and Mary, and puts them in Bethany near Jerusalem. It has the story of the anointing at a supper just before the last Passover, with the 'pistic nard' worth three hundred pence and the objection to the waste; and it expressly identifies the woman with Mary, sister of Martha. But both in 11<sup>2</sup> and 12<sup>3</sup> it tells us that Mary wiped the feet of Jesus with her hair, thereby identifying her with the 'sinful woman' of Lk 7<sup>38</sup>. 'Mary Magdalene' is brought in without an explanation of who she is at Jn 19<sup>25</sup>: it does not seem, therefore, that the writer means us to understand that she is Mary, sister of Martha, about whom so much has been already said.

But if we are to take the statements in 11 and 12 seriously, then we must locate at Bethany the tale of Mary sitting and listening to Jesus; and

<sup>1</sup> See, on this part of the subject, Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 378.

what is still more improbable, we must suppose that this supper-party is independently described in Lk 7, and therefore that Mary was a notorious sinner, so notorious that at the very end of Jesus' career her presence at a supper-party with Jesus is regarded as extraordinary. For if there be only one anointing, it must clearly be placed in the last week, as it is done in the Latin Diatessaron.

Thus it is the Fourth Gospel and the unhistorical use it has made of tradition already in circulation that brings in psychological improbabilities into the figure of Mary, the sister of Martha. Quite distinct from this is the question of the identity of Mary Magdalene and her character: I have attempted to show that there is no reason in any of the Gospels to regard her as either Mary, the sister of Martha, or as the 'sinful woman' of whom we read in Luke. As I understand the matter, the only time Mary Magdalene is mentioned in any of the Gospels apart from the burial of Jesus and the Resurrection is Lk 8<sup>2f</sup>.

It should further be added, in justice to the Fourth Evangelist, that we must not ascribe to him the psychological monstrosity of himself making Mary, the sister of Martha, into a notorious sinner. The only one of all these women that the Gospels themselves put before us as a 'sinner' is the woman in Lk 7<sup>37-50</sup>. The Fourth Evangelist has identified the woman who brought the 'pistic nard' to the supper at Bethany with Mary, sister of Martha and of Lazarus: it is only the presence of certain details in Lk 7 that has made Western interpreters identify Luke's anointing with the anointing at Bethany.

The main conclusions, then, that we should draw is that the story of the 'woman that was a sinner' has received in the form that we read it in Lk 7<sup>37-50</sup> certain details which do not belong to it, but belong to another supper, that at Bethany; and further, that both Mary, sister of Martha, and Mary Magdalene emerge from our inquiry with unblemished reputations.

## Literature.

### THE RELIGION OF ANCIENT PALESTINE IN THE LIGHT OF ARCHÆOLOGY.

ARCHÆOLOGICAL evidence regarding Old Testament history has been accumulating rapidly within

recent years. Ancient sites in Palestine, Syria, and Mesopotamia have been yielding up their secrets in monuments, tablets, and objects of almost every description. Dr. Stanley A. Cook, the well-known Semitic scholar, in his latest work,



*The Religion of Ancient Palestine in the Light of Archaeology* (Milford; 252 pp., 39 plates and 2 maps; 12s. 6d. net), has dealt with the archaeological facts in his usual careful and comprehensive way. The book contains the Schweich Lectures of the British Academy given by Dr. Cook in 1925, and now published for the first time. The delay, which has been due to his other numerous tasks, has enabled him to make use of much new and valuable material, including the recent discoveries at Byblus, Beisan, and other places. The book thus gives us the original lectures rewritten, considerably expanded, and illustrated afresh, although the scheme and scope of them still remain. The field is an extensive and attractive one, and no scholar is more competent to deal with it than Dr. Cook, who has already contributed so much to our knowledge of Palestinian religion. On this occasion, he has deliberately, as he tells us, left on one side questions of the literary and historical criticism of the Biblical records and all theories of the development of religion, and has confined himself to the interpretation of the archaeological evidence. He has certainly succeeded in throwing considerable light on many abstruse problems connected with the Israelite and Oriental worlds. In the first lecture he deals with the facts classified and viewed comparatively, giving the reader considerable enlightenment on cup-marks, rock altars, triads, deities and kings, sphinxes and other Egyptian elements, cult scenes, and numerous other interesting matters. In the remaining two lectures, which treat the subject more historically, he takes up the Old Oriental and Græco-Roman periods respectively, and deals with a great variety of archaeological facts bearing upon them. Hardly anything of archaeological importance from pre-historic times to the foundation of Christianity has escaped some reference or consideration. The wideness of the treatment is due to the fact, often forgotten, that, after all, the Israelites were only a small part of a much larger group of inter-related peoples, and received constant influences from without. One conclusion reached at the end of the volume is that the early religion of Israel, though different from surrounding religions and having quite distinctive features of its own, was not that of the prophets which has given the Old Testament its worth, but had to be re-shaped and invested with a fuller content by the great reforming minds of Israel before it received a permanent value. Any reader who wishes to know what archaeological research is contributing to our knowledge of Palestine, and how profoundly it is affecting

our Biblical and other problems, has only to study this fascinating volume. In addition to the maps and plates, there is an excellent bibliography, a full index of subjects, and a chronological table, suitable at least for working purposes, from 4000 B.C. to A.D. 640.

### THE PROPHEPIC MINISTRY.

Among the Yale lecturers have been numbered not a few of the most distinguished preachers on both sides of the Atlantic, and some of the lectures in printed form have attained something like fame. The prestige of the series will certainly not be diminished by the lectures on *The Prophetic Ministry* (Abingdon Press; \$2.00) delivered by Bishop Francis J. McConnell, of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Towards the end he remarks, 'I have been trying to say all along that it is the function of the prophet to keep religion moral.' There could be no better summary of the book than that. In every chapter he emphasizes the truth that everything that calls itself religious has to be judged by moral tests and standards, and it is the business pre-eminently of the prophet to bring it to this test. The prophet's function—the Bishop tells us—is 'to get moral questions up, and not let them down until they are settled.' The infallible sign of true prophecy is this emphasis upon the moral. Any mystical type of religion which ignores this receives short shrift from Bishop McConnell. The mysticism which implies absorption into God seems to him to imperil the distinctiveness of human personality, and all through the book human values are represented as the chief concern of religion as understood and proclaimed by the Hebrew prophets. Those values are ends in themselves, they are integral to religion, and the aim of the prophets is to proclaim the potential worth and sacredness of human beings. It is with these ideals that the prophet is concerned, not with the programmes through which they may be realized; in that region he is seldom an expert, it is his business to 'keep moral values uppermost.' Essentially even the three temptations of Jesus had to do with moral issues.

The titles of the chapters reveal the various angles from which the Bishop approaches his subject—'The Aim of the Prophets,' 'The Prophetic Idea of God,' 'The Prophet and Mysticism,' 'Prophets and Priests,' 'Prophets and Kings,' 'Prophets and Progress,' 'The Perils of Prophecy,' 'Jesus and Prophecy.' But the burden of them all is that religion must be moralized, and that in

season and out of season it must insist upon the value of human personality. The volume does not teach us much about the contents of the prophetic books, but it admirably reflects their spirit, and it is indeed a moral tonic.

### THE DOCTRINE OF HOLY COMMUNION.

The question of the Eucharist is a thorny question which perhaps more than any other divides the Christian, and particularly the English Christian, world. There are, however, certain signs of a desire on both sides for mutual understanding and approach. On the evangelical side this appears in a tendency towards a deeper appreciation of the sacrament; on the 'Catholic' side in a certain disposition to appreciate the rival point of view, together with a growing consciousness that the old metaphysic upon which the doctrine of transubstantiation was based is gone, and that the new age calls for a thorough restatement of the doctrine. Accordingly we regard as very timely the publication of *The Evangelical Doctrine of Holy Communion*, edited by the Rev. A. J. Macdonald, D.D. (Heffer; 8s. 6d. net). It is the work of a body of scholars belonging to the evangelical section of the Church of England. In method it is historical, tracing the doctrine from its origin in the New Testament, through the Greek and Latin Fathers and the Middle Ages, to the Reformation and the Anglican theology of to-day. A chapter is devoted to the Free Church presentation of the doctrine. Several of the writers are specialists in the periods of which they write, and the whole is a work of great historical value, scholarly and informative, a reliable guide through the maze of the Christian ages and a worthy presentation of a great and vital theme.

### JESUS AND THE LAW.

'Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law, till all things be accomplished.' Did Jesus really say that? This and all cognate questions relating to the attitude of Jesus to the Jewish Law are discussed with admirable sanity and on a basis of wide learning by Professor Bennett Harvie Branscomb, Ph.D., in *Jesus and the Law of Moses* (Hodder & Stoughton; 8s. 6d. net). The adequate discussion of these questions demands a thorough knowledge of the literature reflecting the Jewish background of the Gospels and an intimate acquaintance with that phase of New Testament criticism which affects the sources and the literary

history of the Gospels. In both these directions Dr. Branscomb is fully equipped. In successive chapters he discusses 'The Law of Moses in Jewish Thought in the First Century,' 'The Synoptic Gospels and their Several Attitudes toward the Law,' 'The Traditions preserved about Jesus and the Law in Mark,' 'The Evidence of the Q Source,' and 'The Traditions preserved only in Matthew.' The careful examination of sources is of the highest importance, because the Gospels, as they stand, contain utterances of Jesus ranging all the way from complete rejection of the Law to its complete affirmation, but even such an examination does not lead to any very satisfactory result, as 'within the several strata the same divergent material has been found,' and the discussion must be conducted in the light of larger considerations.

Dr. Branscomb rightly fastens on the conflicts between Jesus and the Pharisees as illustrative more than anything else of the attitude of Jesus to the Law. Those conflicts, he believes, were much more numerous than are recorded in our Gospels, but those that are recorded he subjects to a searching examination—for example, the controversies over eating with sinners, fasting, the Sabbath, the washing of hands, etc. The argument tends to make clear 'the independence and freedom of Jesus from the whole scribal movement.' Jesus did not despise the ritual, but the needs of men took with Him precedence over ritual regulations: the paramount obligation is that of meeting human need. This is how Dr. Branscomb sums it up: 'It is important to observe that this work of Jesus, strengthening and enforcing the ethical aspects of Judaism to the neglect of its ceremonial and its formal or impersonal elements, did not rest upon any opposition to the formal or ritual side of the religion. It is only as these duties conflicted with his conception of righteousness in ethical terms that Jesus ignored or rejected them'; and Dr. Branscomb happily suggests that the fundamental reason for Saul's programme of persecution was the perception of his trained mind that here was a teaching destructive of Pharisaism. 'If Jesus' teaching were accepted, the ultimate authority in religion would no longer be the Law of Moses but general moral principles.'

In the course of the discussion we learn much about the teaching of the Pharisees through direct quotation from the Rabbis, also about the sects into which the Jewish world of that time was divided. All the Synoptic Gospels, including Matthew, are regarded as products of the Gentile Church, while 'Q came out of a circle of Christians



who had felt persecution at the hands of the Pharisees.' The book is a masterly and illuminating contribution to the solution of a complicated question. There are a few slips which should be corrected in the next edition. The δ should, of course, be deleted from ἀγαθὸς on p. 23; correct 'riseth' to 'risest' on p. 31; בן אדם to בן אדם on p. 144; ἑξῆς to ἑξῆς on p. 147; 'Wellhausen' to 'Wellhausen' on pp. 202 and 296; 'Boussett' to 'Bousset' on p. 283; and 'tradiut pour le premier fois' on p. 284.

### THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

*Paul and the Intellectuals* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net) is a commentary on the Epistle to the Colossians by Professor A. T. Robertson, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D., of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky. Dr. Robertson's name is a guarantee that the scholarship is competent and the theology conservative in the best sense. The volume takes its title from the fact that the Epistle to the Colossians is St. Paul's 'body blow' against the incipient Gnosticism of his day. The expositions are on popular lines, but there are many footnotes in which the author's critical equipment appears. The style of exposition might well have been more arresting, and certain things might have been more happily or more elegantly expressed. But it is a very useful little commentary, and a special feature of it—for which many readers will be grateful—is the way in which it weaves together brief quotations from previous commentators.

It is Dr. Robertson's conviction that St. Paul was no mere rabbinizer or hellenizer, his faith and philosophy being founded on an unshakable experience of Jesus Christ. No doubt he took over terms of the Gnostic movement such as 'mystery' and 'fulness,' but this is not to allow that he was influenced by the Gnostics in his Christian conceptions. In the Introduction there is an informative account of 'the new heresy in the Lycus valley.'

### ARTHUR S. PEAKE.

It is a delicate task for a son to write the story of his father's life, but that task has been brilliantly achieved by Mr. Leslie S. Peake in the *Memoir* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net), which is indeed what it claims to be, 'An Intimate Study of the Man and his Work.' For a full generation Professor Peake's praise has been in all the Churches, but

to those who did not know him as a personal friend this book will come with something of the force of a revelation. It is difficult to say which is the more astounding—the industry or the versatility of the man. No British scholar has done so much as he to teach the religious public the modern view of the Bible; by the books which he wrote and edited he affected opinion both widely and profoundly. But he was far more than a Biblical scholar and expositor; he was administrator, preacher, and ecclesiastical statesman as well. Though a student, at times putting fifteen hours of work into his day, he was no recluse. He faithfully attended the innumerable University and Church committees of which he was a member; he played a conspicuous and heroic part in the union of the Methodist Churches, and as one of the universally trusted leaders of the Free Churches, he gave much of his time and strength to the negotiations designed to promote union between those Churches and the Church of England. Everywhere the judicial, sympathetic quality of his mind was recognized. 'Again and again,' says the Archbishop of Canterbury, 'it was his openness of mind and breadth of brotherly sympathy which enabled us to continue.' He was a temperance advocate, a champion of foreign missions, a Sunday School reformer, and so passionately interested in the poor that, as a young man, he had intended, before discovering his real *métier*, to devote his life to the service of the slums in the East End of London.

The wonderful thing about Peake was his combination of radical criticism and evangelical passion, and the story affords occasional glimpses into his inner life, with its fine spirit of surrender, which are well fitted to reassure students of theology that scholarship, so far from being a drag on their evangelism, should be a spur to it. An admirable summary of Peake's various writings is given, the interest of which is occasionally enhanced by accounts of the criticisms to which they were subjected when they appeared. Great Biblical scholar as he was, it was as a humble servant of Jesus Christ that he wished to be remembered. This excellently written memoir is full of interest and stimulus; it will be eagerly read not only by students and ministers, but by all who care to hear the story of a strenuous and noble life.

### THE ISSUES OF LIFE.

Dr. Henry Nelson Wieman, who holds the Chair of Philosophy of Religion in the Faculty of the Divinity School at Chicago University, writes in

an attractive idealistic strain in a new work entitled *The Issues of Life* (Abingdon Press; \$2.00). It deals in a reflective, yet popular, style with everyday problems of life, such as the attainment of maturity in conduct, the realization of the great positive values in friendship, the increase of vital energy (a problem both biochemical and psychological), and the achievement of the good. But the main theme of the book is the 'supreme issue' of life, which is described as follows: 'What is that order of existence and possibility upon which we must depend and to which we must conform, to bring human life to its highest fulfilment and to promote the greatest possible values?'

This question—which bears on the face of it a certain *petitio principii*—is discussed in the last five chapters, respectively entitled Religion, God and the Ideal, Life and Scientific Method, Personality, The Last Devotion.

Apparently following Mr. Lippmann and John Dewey, the author calls the way of life which he advocates the way of 'high religion,' or of 'the last devotion,' which is a dedication of life in supreme devotion to an order of existence and possibility in great part unknown. The advocate of religion without God makes the ideal the supreme object of religious devotion. But it is the author's contention that if ideal means the best to be attained, even though that best be very different from our human idea of it, then God is essentially involved in its attainment. For God is that order of existence and possibility by virtue of which the greatest possible good is truly a possibility and can be achieved by human effort. Accordingly, devotion to the supreme ideal must be devotion to God. And the order which is God is the order of community which leads to highest values, or—in very simple and very ancient language—the order of love.

But how does religion attain knowledge of God? There is no esoteric religious method of getting knowledge. The true and only method, in religion as in other spheres of culture, is empirical. 'Only through communication, through the stimulating interchange of ideas and inventions and through deep community of heart and mind do the Orient gates unlock to spacious days that dawn.' And personality is that which communicates. And prayer at its best is the deliberate establishment of those attitudes of personality through which the order of God can possess the world.

It is an elusive book, and many would find it vague, wordy, and repetitive. Yet it is full of suggestion, and should appeal in particular to the

youthful reader in whom the pulse of idealism beats high. To sentences like these such an one is ready to respond: 'There is a kind of religion which engenders a vital striving that is invincible. It is invincible because it feeds on pain and failure and all manner of trouble with almost as much gusto and nourishment as it finds in comforts and successes. . . . Some would classify such religious living with the irrationality of the animal urge. But it is just the opposite. It is life [sustained and inspired by that order of unexplored possibilities which constitutes the invaluable object of devotion for all human living.'

#### CHRISTIAN UNITY.

Of the making of books on Christian Unity there is no end; the mass is becoming almost unmanageable. Yet there is always room for the best, and Professor John T. McNeill in *Unitive Protestantism: A Study in our Religious Resources* (Abingdon Press; \$3.00), gives us one which is well worth adding to whatever number any of our readers already possess.

Its value and interest do not lie in the end-sections which summarize what has been summarized so often—the steps towards reunion that have been recently either actually taken or proposed. We concur in the wise words of warning against unions that are advocated like commercial mergers, and any that instead of doing justice to the past propose simply to ignore it; an ignored past is likely sooner or later to rise against us. But the main value of this book lies in its survey of the views of the Church held by the great reformers who all feared and hated schism, and clung to the idea of the visible Catholic Church. The teaching, say, of Calvin on that point has been strangely forgotten precisely where Calvinism took deepest root. In this section the author casts light upon many things; we may mention the Marburg Colloquy which in his view failed, in so far as it was a failure, through the poetical complications of the situation.

The destroyers of Protestant unity have been such things as a total misunderstanding of Luther's doctrine of the priesthood of all believers as implying individualism; the subjection of Protestant Churches to State-domination; and, above all, intolerance. Yet Protestantism at no time totally lost sight of the ideal of unity which in our own day has come once more to the forefront. We have here a scholarly work based on wide reading and sound reflection, a work which, we repeat,



will prove a valuable addition to the extensive literature already available.

### THE NEW GENERATION.

A book has been published with the above title. The publishers are Messrs. Allen & Unwin, and the price 20s. net. As may be surmised, it is a (physically) weighty volume, the result of the combined wisdom of thirty-three writers. Brief biographies of the thirty-three are given in an appendix, and we ascertain from it that nearly all of the writers are American. They are most of them quite unknown on this side. There are some, however, whose fame has reached us, like Dr. John B. Watson, the protagonist of 'Behaviourism,' and we know our Havelock Ellis. The company, and the subject, are introduced to the reader by Dr. Bertrand Russell in a characteristic essay, and perhaps this is a sufficient indication of the general standpoint of the volume.

What is the general result of this co-operative wisdom? Well, we gather that the new generation is in revolt, pretty much against everything. They no longer reverence God (who would?), or their parents (thank goodness), or authority. They have thrown off the outworn adult ethics and are indulging in sex experiments. The family is going, partly because of the Industrial Revolution, partly because schools are taking over parental duties, and partly because we are becoming enlightened. The family *ought* to go (Dr. John B. Watson), and children ought to be 'brought up' in clinics and institutions. 'We have come to see that this mother-love complex is fraught with more dangers than benefits.' The whole business must be changed. In particular child-bearing must be made a paid profession. What we need is (or are) children's clinics, the new psychology, psycho-analysis, sociologists, sexologists, and real educators (as distinguished from servile pedagogues). And we must not forget the Freudian psychology, 'which is indispensable.' There are more general deliverances, such as these. It is no longer Satan who makes sin, but glands. The influence of the Churches depends on human misery and impotence. At present the State, except in Russia, is in the grip of moral and religious prejudices which make it totally incapable of dealing with children in a scientific manner. And, finally, about religious belief, science teaches us that human life is the chance product of material forces, an accident unplanned and unforeseen in the history of the planet. Youth may revere Mr. Wells or Mr. Ber-

trand Russell; it is only spinsters who continue to revere the Almighty or His Son.

The above is not an unfair summary of the conclusions of this volume. It may be questioned whether any other country than America could have furnished such a choice selection of cranks. The calm way in which the most questionable and eccentric statements are made as though they were axiomatic is first irritating, and then amusing. There are passages (and even essays) with sense and restraint in them, as one would expect in a volume of seven hundred pages. But on the whole we have seldom read a book in which the most debatable propositions are laid down with more dogmatic assertiveness. It may be pointed out that nearly all the positions in the book follow from its blank atheism. And by far the most significant pages in it are those in which Mr. Joad confesses that the present generation have thrown away religion and have nothing to put in its place. It would be difficult to find a more convincing illustration than this work offers of the intimate connexion between religion and decent morality.

A book of a totally different character, and one that can be unreservedly commended to all who have the care of children is *The Modern Parent: A Practical Guide to Everyday Problems*, by Mr. Garry C. Myers, Ph.D., Head of the Parental Education Division in Cleveland College, U.S.A. (Williams & Norgate; 8s. 6d. net). It would be difficult to exaggerate the value of this wise book for parents and educators. It is the result of wide experience and detailed observation of family life. In a series of chapters on parents 'who scold, who are inconsistent, who disagree before their children, who are discourteous,' and so on, we have not only sound sense but actual illustrative incidents that will touch the conscience and instruct the minds of any who are fortunate enough to possess this guide. It would be an admirable present for a newly married couple, and would probably save them from disastrous blunders.

### LUZZATTI.

No man who sets before the public a review of 'mankind from China to Peru,' and strides from centuries B.C. to the Great War, can hope in this age of highly specialized knowledge to do more than create a prejudice against himself. Not even so very great a man as Signor Luzzatti, by whose death Italy lost a figure little less interesting than *il Duce* himself. Luzzatti, himself a theist of

Jewish origin unable to associate with any particular sect of believers but sympathetic with all, devoted much study to the subject of religious toleration and did great work to secure it. His huge second edition of *Die Nella Libertà* has, with some omissions, been translated and published as a fitting monument 'to commemorate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the first constitutional establishment of religious liberty' in America—*God in Freedom: Studies in the Relations between Church and State* (Macmillan; \$5.00). 'Monument' is the word. The work is colossal. It embraces a bewildering variety of topics from 'the Homer of Buddhism' to 'Our Feline Human Nature.' It is in our view an endless pity that the editor did not confine himself with greater strictness to such papers by Luzzatti as bore directly on the matter indicated in the sub-title. Even when we do that for ourselves, we must confess that while the range of Luzzatti's knowledge almost staggers us, we are not deeply impressed with the accuracy of the information he gives regarding the parts with which we ourselves are familiar, nor with his generalizations. We value far higher the added papers by four American writers, among them Mr. William H. Taft.

The same principles have been applied further by Christianity, to bring man to a proper relationship not only with that which is human but that which is divine, not only that which is but that which ought to be. Thus there is no real conflict between the new psychology and Christianity. Psycho-analysis has merely added the weight of its evidence to the eternal truths originally revealed in the life and teaching of Jesus.'

After *Two Thousand Years*, by Mr. G. Lowes Dickinson (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net), is a dialogue between Plato and a very modern young man. They meet in the Elysian Fields, and discuss all sorts of questions dealing with property, government, socialism, war, and education, finishing up with the future life. The writing, as may be anticipated, is brilliant, and the thinking quite emancipated. And, whether the reader finds enlightenment in the arguments or no, he will certainly get entertainment and mental stimulus. It is always helpful, as well as interesting, to hear two clever people discussing the universe, and that is what we are permitted to do in this volume, which has all the familiar characteristics of the writer's well-known mentality.

Bishop Clifford E. Barbour, Ph.D., has written a book with the intriguing title *Sin and the New Psychology* (Abingdon Press; \$2.00). His aim is to show that the new psychology has by no means antiquated the Christian doctrines of sin and salvation. On the contrary, the psychologist who speaks of libido and complexes and reintegration is dealing with problems as old as human nature, problems which find their supreme solution in the gospel. Dr. Barbour's handling of the subject is both wise and well informed. In his opening chapters he gives a sufficient sketch of the new psychology in its various schools, and indicates the profound influence it is having on the moral and religious thought of to-day. He then goes on in the light of this to analyse the doctrine of sin in its origin, its influence on the soul, and the possibility of its elimination. In each case he finds that the terminology of the new psychology is capable of a Christian interpretation, and that much that psycho-analysis would do for the soul is more effectively accomplished by Christian faith. 'Some have claimed that psycho-analysis has unlocked the door to greater glory for mankind, but Christianity has always held the key. . . .

Under the title *Tyrol under the Axe of Italian Fascism*, Messrs. Allen & Unwin Ltd. have published a translation of a fiery narrative of and protest against the treatment of the native population of South Tyrol by Mussolini and the Fascists since the annexation of the former Austrian province by Italy. It is written by an exiled Tyrolese patriot, Dr. Eduard Reut-Nicolussi (12s. 6d. net). Though elected one of the representatives of Tyrol in the Italian Parliament, yet the writer of this story had to make good his escape from his native land to avoid arrest by Mussolini's agents. He has used his liberty to tell, without restraint, to fellow-Germans in Austria, Germany, and the United States the story of the years of studied and cruel oppression, as he alleges, of the native people of the South Tyrol. They made their appeal to the Conference at Versailles, and especially to President Wilson at its head, that they should not be placed under Italian rule, but this having failed they still hoped that a land of German legend and of heroes in peasants' garb would be left in the enjoyment of its ancient customs, its language, its schools, and its methods of administering justice. On the contrary, it is alleged that everything is being done to make the province Italian and its people the slaves of their conquerors. Thus far he has



not succeeded in raising up a champion among the other nations. Here is a case for the League of Nations, but Mussolini would not brook its interference.

*The Revolt against Dualism*, by Professor A. O. Lovejoy (Allen & Unwin; 15s. net), is a volume of over three hundred pages of small print—so that in all there must be one hundred and seventy thousand words in the book—written on the subject of sense-perception, under the above heading. It is concerned not with Manicheism, but with a discussion of what actually happens when we perceive an object in space. This is a topic which exercised the ingenuity of the Scottish School since the days of Reid and Hamilton, so that we have a kind of hereditary interest in it. How important it is, in its implications, this volume will show, for, though to the ordinary man this at first sight appears much ado about nothing, yet it is not so.

This long book is none too long for its subject, and there is no irrelevancy. The author writes with an amazing wealth of knowledge, so that we have here a résumé, full and fair, of one of the fundamental problems of philosophy from Descartes down to Whitehead and Bertrand Russell. The style is excellent and although the subject-matter is technical, the treatment is extremely interesting. The upshot of the book is that all attempts to resolve mind into matter or matter into mind fail, and are bound to fail; and yet so keenly is the author alive to the mystery of knowledge that he closes with a Platonic mythus, after the manner of the *Timæus*. The author is already well known for his work in the realm of pure philosophy, and this new volume will add to his already great reputation.

In these days mathematics is having a big innings and even threatens to swallow up all the physical sciences. The very elements of the world, as known to science, are nothing else, we are assured, but mathematical symbols. In these circumstances we welcome the appearance of *Number the Language of Science*, by Professor Tobias Dantzig, Ph.D. (Allen & Unwin; 10s. net). In this book is given an exposition of the fundamental ideas which have revolutionized mathematical thought during the last twenty years. 'The historic method has been freely used to bring out the rôle intuition has played in the evolution of mathematical concepts. And so the story of number is here unfolded as an historical pageant of ideas, linked with the men who created these ideas and with the epochs which produced the men.' The exposition is lucid and, consider-

ing the subject, wonderfully intelligible and interesting to the lay reader. In the earlier chapters there is a considerable amount of fascinating lore in regard to primitive methods of counting, and such things as amicable numbers, the discovery of zero and the squaring of the circle. One is puzzled by a reference to 'Abraham proceeding to the rescue of his brother Eliasar with 218 slaves.' Can the reference be to Abraham proceeding to the rescue of Lot against the king of Ellasar with 318 slaves?

In the later chapters we are led into ever deeper waters, till we are brought to the anatomy of the infinite and the grand dispute over the possibility of the last transfinite. In a concluding chapter it is shown that every criterion of rational reality involves mathematical concepts. 'How, then, can we arrive at a criterion? Not by evidence, for the dice of evidence are loaded. Not by logic, for logic has no existence independent of mathematics: it is only one phase of this multiphased necessity that we call mathematics. How, then, shall mathematical concepts be judged? *They shall not be judged.* 'Mathematics is the supreme judge; from its decisions there is no appeal.'

So much is written and said about the urgency of Reunion that a counterblast was to be expected, and this has been provided with a vengeance in *Founded on Rock, United not Uniform Christianity: A Plea for Reality*, by the Rev. Frank Ballard, D.D., B.Sc. (James Clarke; 5s. net). The book is an ardent plea for unity instead of union. Union, says Dr. Ballard, is next to impossible. Union with Rome means submission. Union with Episcopacy means something rather like submission. Why talk of what is not practical politics? Is Union even desirable? What is wanted is real Christianity in all the churches. Dr. Ballard has a facile (and an acid) pen, and he pursues this theme through twelve chapters. He has been so long engaged in controversy that he is apt to indulge in a somewhat provocative tone. He does not mince his words, and it cannot be denied that some of his criticisms are justified. But less excitable readers will gladly admit the soundness of his plea for unity as the chief necessity without one whit lessening their desire for union. The arguments for union are too well known and too convincing to need repetition. But we are all the better of being reminded that union is not the end, only the means.

*The Life of the Spirit in the Modern Man*, by Mr. J. H. Bodgener (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net),

is of the nature of a guide-book on personal religion written in the speech of to-day. In its various chapters the writer deals with the awakening of the soul and its discovery of God in Christ, he traces the several highways of beauty, truth, and love by which it travels towards perfection, and he shows how it is developed and disciplined through the conflicts of life. The various topics are handled with insight and sympathy, while the pages are brightened by illustrative quotations drawn from many sources. A reference to Nietzsche may be quoted as showing him in an unusually pleasing light. 'Nietzsche, in his youth, was led unawares into a house of ill fame. Realising the evil of his surroundings, he rushed to the piano—"the only thing in the room with a soul"—and, striking the keyboard, passed into a world immune from temptation.'

*Essentials* (Hodder & Stoughton ; 5s. net), by Professor P. Carnegie Simpson, D.D., is sub-entitled 'A Few Plain Essays on the Main Things.' They certainly deal, as is promised, with the 'main things'; for they treat of life, love, work, duty, experience, and belief. And they are 'plain essays'; for they are written not only with an engaging frankness and candour, but also in a clear and withal graceful style, such as should attract the 'sensible' and 'not very orthodox' folk for whom they are intended.

Even when, as in the essay on Belief in God, the writer touches profundities, he does so in a way that should be welcome to the uninitiated. It is, for example, an admirably 'plain' exposition he gives of the well-known principle (attributed to Kepler) that in the rational explanation of the world we think God's thoughts after Him. But, generally speaking, the metaphysical is as much avoided as, throughout the volume, the 'parsonified tone of voice' and the 'theological accent.'

Here is quite a good example, taken almost at random, of the writer's style: 'What are the two supreme qualities in friendship? Emerson named them as Truth and Tenderness. The one is a little hard; the other a little soft. I prefer to say that the supreme qualities in friendship are *Understanding* and *Loyalty*. Understanding is truth which can see and sympathise; loyalty is tenderness which is ever faithful. The last is indispensable. Treachery is the sin against the Holy Spirit of friendship; and it takes a Jesus to forgive a Judas.'

*Straight and Crooked Thinking*, by Mr. Robert H.

Thouless, Ph.D. (Hodder & Stoughton ; 5s. net), is a thoroughly racy and delightful book. Fallacies in reasoning are usually dealt with in a somewhat ponderous way in books of logic, so that many a student carries in his breast a smouldering resentment against the convolutions of the syllogism. But Dr. Thouless is a master of straight thinking and clear writing. He is a most pleasant and entertaining guide as he leads us among pitfalls of analogy, tricks of argument and fallacies of logic. The various errors are abundantly illustrated, and a discussion is appended in the form of a dialogue in which all the elements of crooked thinking are cleverly combined. This book should prove a genuine help to any one who would learn to think clearly and argue soundly.

*Religion and the Reign of Science*, by Mr. F. Leslie Cross, M.A., B.Sc. (Longmans ; 4s. net), is a most useful introduction to the subject of which it treats. If any one unversed in modern science wishes to have a brief, clear, up-to-date account of what is being taught to-day, and of how the present situation in the scientific world has arisen, he could not do better than read this book. The various chapters treat of Religion in relation to Physics, Biology, Psychology, Biblical Criticism, Philosophy, and the Life of the Spirit. In each case the treatment is necessarily concise and elementary, but on the whole it is sufficient to give the lay reader an intelligent grasp of the subject and to show him the bearings of modern science in its several branches on the supreme problems of morality and religion.

*In Religion and the Mysterious*, by the Rev. F. H. Brabant (Longmans ; 4s. net), the writer gives a careful analysis of our sense of the mysterious, especially in its relation to the religious life. He deals first with Mystery in Life, second with Mystery in the Bible and the Church, and lastly with the Mysterious and the Supernatural. While confessing indebtedness to Otto, he follows his own line with clearness and vigour. The argument of the book, briefly, is that 'there are two passions in the human heart, both planted in it by the Creator—the passion to understand and the passion to adore.' To attempt to understand without adoration is to put a strain on human nature which it will not stand. It leads to the sin of pride. It is a self-contradictory ideal, for to know all would be to become God. It is a self-distorting ideal, for the human faculty of wonder and reverence must not be starved. On the other hand, to adore with-



out trying to understand is also no ideal for man. It is a creed for slaves and is the mother of superstition. In the harmonious combination of these two passions lies the way to a reasonable faith.

*George Whitefield: The Awakener* is the title of the latest biography of the notable evangelical of the eighteenth century, contemporary and intimate friend of the Wesleys. The wonderful story of this 'pioneer of modern evangelism' is retold not only with whole-hearted sympathy and enthusiasm, but with remarkable skill by the Rev. A. D. Belden, B.D., the present Superintendent of 'Whitefield's,' London, who has already a good deal of literary work to his credit (Sampson Low; 12s. 6d. net). 'Whitefield has a challenge for the youth of the modern world and for the youth of our Evangelical Churches especially.' 'His sublime audacity in the cause of the Gospel,' 'His relentless insistence upon "new birth" for human nature is likely to find a fresh vogue in the hitherto least likely quarters to-day'—these are the main points that Mr. Belden emphasizes as justifying this new biography. He has secured an introduction to it with characteristic and telling phrases and sentences from the Prime Minister. Mr. MacDonald thinks that 'it is particularly happy that this story of the greatest evangelist of the English-speaking race should be a heritage held in common by our American cousins and ourselves. Both nations are equally and permanently indebted to this intrepid apostle of faith'; therefore he recommends 'this presentation of the challenge of the eighteenth century revival to the Churches and the Masses of our own age.' In the Churches of every denomination at present there are many young clergy and ministers who cannot fail to gain fresh courage and to be animated with more fervent zeal by reading this vivid narrative of the pot-boy in a Gloucester public-house of two hundred years ago who when asked by his mother, 'Will you go to Oxford, George?' replied, 'With all my heart.' There he joined the Holy Club of which John and Charles Wesley, younger students than himself, were the most enthusiastic members. The association of these three Oxford students was destined to be lifelong and, despite their differences, revolutionary in its influence on the social and religious life of two centuries. Mr. Belden thinks that Whitefield's part, though he did not, like the Wesleys, found a new religious denomination, has been seriously underrated. As a young student who had become a deacon in Holy Orders, he made an extraordinary impression in London, just as young

Charles Spurgeon did a century later. He dared to go to the United States as the Wesleys had done, and there made a great impression where the Wesleys had failed. He made altogether thirteen voyages to and fro across the Atlantic, attracted large congregations and inevitably large crowds out of doors by his preaching and preaching alone. Here was no Mr. Moody with Mr. Sankey and his hymns and harmonium. His influence in England, Wales, and Scotland, wherever he went, was equally extraordinary. His preaching moved crowds not merely to hysterical emotions but to true repentance. He built up a number of congregations in different towns that remain even to the present, just as he built up two in London, each of which has had a notable history, and that now known as 'Whitefield's' in Tottenham Court Road is the most influential of their successors. Mr. Belden has not been content to deal fully with Whitefield's manifold efforts as a preacher, but has written elaborate chapters on the evangelical revival, theological, psychological, and sociological.

In *The Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, vol. x. (for 1928-29), just issued (Milford; 21s. net), by Professor Ephraim A. Speiser, Field-Director of the Baghdad School, the new Kirkuk documents relating to Family Laws are fully described in seventy-five interesting pages. The Nuzi tablets now constitute one of the largest collections of cuneiform tablets dug up on a single site. The group (forty in number) dealt with by Professor Speiser forms part of those published last year under the title 'Texts of Varied Contents' (Harvard Semitic Series, v.). In the first part of the paper we have a schematic presentation of the types of records in question and an analysis of their contents; the remainder gives the texts in transliteration and translation, followed by brief philological comments. The *Annual* also contains a comparative list of the signs in the so-called Indo-Sumerian Seals, by Professor George A. Barton, from which the conclusion is drawn that the writing represents an original and independent culture, though probably in its later period it was in touch with the Sumerians.

With the publication of *The Psalms, Book V. A Revised Translation* (Milford; 1s. net), Mr. F. H. Wales, B.D. (Oxon.), brings his translation of the Psalter to an end. This volume, like the earlier ones, exhibits a fine combination of the conservative and the liberal spirit. Mr. Wales never needlessly departs from AV or RV. Some-

"A thing of Beauty is a Joy for Ever."

## Arts & Crafts

✠ TO ADORN AND  
BEAUTIFY THE  
CHURCH ✠

A STAINED Glass Window is one of the most beautiful forms for a Memorial to be placed in a Church. The Glass, with its jewel-like rich colouring, is most decorative, and the whole appearance of the Building in which the Window is placed is enriched and beautified, and a more reverent atmosphere created.

AN increasing number of Scottish Churches are availing themselves of Messrs. Maile's craftsmanship. A list of places where examples of their Stained Glass, Church Furniture, and Memorial Tablets may be seen will be gladly sent on request, as well as the following interesting Booklets (Post Free):  
(a) "Bronze and Brass Mural Tablets."

(b) "The Glory of Stained Glass" (showing Church Windows of rich jewel-like colouring).

(c) "Carved Oak Church Furniture," Vases, Banners, etc.  
(d) "Beautiful Churchyard Memorials" (in the Silvery-Grey Cornish Granite).

**G. Maile & Son Ltd.**

(Founded 1785).

London's Premier Church Art Craftsmen

367 Euston Road, London, N.W.1



Stained Glass Window erected in Beith Parish Church, Ayr.

"All that is Beautiful shall Abide for Ever."

## Student Christian Movement Press

### PATHWAYS TO CERTAINTY

By Dr. WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN, Union Theological Seminary, New York. 8s. 6d. net.

The finest intellects of the race have grappled for centuries with the issues raised in this book; how we know ourselves, the world, and God; whether indeed we can know anything certainly, or whether all our knowledge is not mere wish-born illusions. This book seeks to show where and how we can find certainty.

### THEISM AND THE MODERN MOOD

By Dr. WALTER HORTON. With an Introduction by Dr. WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN.

4s. and 2s. 6d. net.

### THE HOLY SPIRIT

By Dr. RAYMOND CALKINS.

5s. net.

A book of unusual sermons.

### THE RELIGION OF JESUS

By TOYOHIKO KAGAWA, the famous Japanese Christian. Translated by HELEN F. TOPPING. Edited with a Biographical Sketch by W. H. MURRAY WALTON. 4s. net.

**58 Bloomsbury Street, London, W.C.1**

## The next four issues FREE.

We are anxious to bring to the notice of all readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES the many merits of

# PUBLIC OPINION

which presents in a handy form each week a complete summary of the best thought and activity of the world, and for the man and woman anxious to know everything worth while it is an essential.

It informs, stimulates and saves time in a unique way, it is readable from beginning to end and is a great acquisition to any house.

All you have to do is to send a postcard with your name and address to The Manager, *Public Opinion*, 44 Essex Street, Strand, W.C.2, and you will receive a copy of the paper for the next four weeks.

## TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THIS GENEROUS OFFER BY SENDING YOUR POSTCARD NOW

WHEN WRITING TO ADVERTISERS PLEASE MENTION THE EXPOSITORY TIMES



# Wolsey Hall, Oxford

Founded



in 1894

POSTAL TUITION  
FOR

## B.D.

DEGREE EXAMS.

During the years 1922-1929

### 152

WOLSEY HALL STUDENTS  
PASSED

B.D. Degree Exams. of London (53), Durham (32), Lampeter (28), Dublin (24), and other Universities.

AT LONDON UNIVERSITY

### B.D. HONS.

(EXTERNAL) JUNE 1930:

2 Wolsey Hall Students Sat,  
BOTH PASSED, AND WERE  
THE ONLY  
SUCCESSFUL CANDIDATES

Also in a wide range of Theological Subjects  
from amongst which the undermentioned form a very small selection:

Apologetics  
Aramaic  
Biblical History  
Church History  
Comparative Religion  
Dogmatics  
Ethics

Greek  
Hebrew  
Homiletics  
Liturgiology  
Missions, History and Methods  
New Testament, Old Testament:  
Theology, Canon, Text, History

Pastoral Theology  
Patristics  
Philosophy, Theological  
Psychology of Religion  
Sermon Preparation  
Social Questions

### Prospectus Free

An 80-pp. Prospectus and Specimen Lesson will be sent on receipt of request giving full particulars of exam. or subject in which tuition may be required. Address the Secretary, Dept. GE 45,

## Wolsey Hall, Oxford

PROPRIETORS: DIPLOMA CORRESPONDENCE COLLEGE, LTD.

BAPTIST UNION MINISTERIAL EXAMINATIONS, 1930: 20 WOLSEY HALL STUDENTS SAT--17 PASSED

WHEN WRITING TO ADVERTISERS PLEASE MENTION *THE EXPOSITORY TIMES*

times he rightly adopts RV margin into his text, as in Ps 136<sup>15</sup>—he ‘*shook off Pharaoh*’ (RV overthrew), and sometimes he produces his effect by a more literal translation, as in 122<sup>2</sup> (‘our feet *were standing*’). There is an occasional flash of real poetry, as in 107<sup>29</sup>, ‘he stilleth the storm to a whisper,’ and at not a few points there are improvements upon the familiar English versions: for example, ‘I believe; but when I spake, I was sore afflicted’ (116<sup>10</sup>), ‘deck the feast with branches’ (118<sup>27</sup>), ‘let thy good spirit lead me in a plain path’ (for the improbable ‘land of uprightness’) (143<sup>10</sup>). ‘He filleth the valleys *with the nations*’ (110<sup>6</sup>) is a more dubious alteration, and ‘may my right hand *with*er’—which rests on a simple transformation of the radicals—seems preferable to ‘may my right hand *forget*’ (137<sup>6</sup>). We are not sure that we like the phrase ‘in the day of thy *hosting*’ (110<sup>3</sup>): this, and ‘dearworth’ for ‘precious’ (116<sup>15</sup>) seem too recondite for the simple language of the Psalter. The theme of Ps 119 is made luminous by the printing in each verse of the various synonyms for ‘the law’ in black letters. The translation, which is the work of a careful and reverent scholar, is a very distinct improvement on the Revised Version, and it is much to be hoped that the five parts will speedily appear in one volume.

Major J. W. Povah, B.D., has contrived to pack an immense amount of careful and valuable work into twenty-six pages in his *Aids to the Study of the Historical Narratives of the Old Testament and the Apocrypha* (obtainable from the author, 10 Digswell Road, Welwyn Garden City, Herts; 6d., post free 7d.). He divides the history of the Hebrews into ten sections, beginning with the Judges and ending with the Maccabees, and within each section the very important events stand out in black lettering. The book presupposes an earnest student who is anxious to reach the ultimate facts and who is not unwilling to take the trouble which that may entail. Thus the LXX, where it is valuable (as in the addition to 1 S 14<sup>41</sup>) or corrective of the Hebrew consonantal or vocalic text (cf. 1 K 19<sup>3</sup> MT ‘he saw,’ LXX ‘he was afraid’) is drawn upon, as are also the prophets Amos, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Haggai, Zechariah, where they helpfully supplement the historical narrative. There are occasional notes of a quasi-exegetical kind (cf. Neh 6<sup>10</sup>), but the book makes no pretence to be a substitute for a commentary. It rests on a minute knowledge of the original text, and is capable of rendering fine service to students who

have the ambition to read the Bible ‘with the understanding also.’

Three volumes of the Religious Tract Society’s Devotional Commentary have come to hand, namely, *Deuteronomy*, by the Ven. A. R. Buckland, M.A., and *The Gospel according to St. John*, by the Rev. T. W. Gilbert, D.D. (2 vols.). The character of these commentaries is sufficiently well known. Avoiding all critical questions and the minutiae of exegesis, they aim at giving to the devout reader the main teachings of the book studied.

Archdeacon Buckland has already written for this series the volumes of 1st and 2nd Thessalonians, and his work here maintains the same standard of scholarship and sound sense. Each chapter of Deuteronomy is treated under a number of short paragraphs, many of which have most suggestive titles. A number of apt quotations judiciously introduced makes this a most readable volume throughout.

The two volumes on St. John’s Gospel have not been quite so well planned. One volume is given to the first six chapters, with the result that the remaining fifteen chapters have to be compressed into the second volume. The writer does not attempt a detailed commentary, but gives in each volume about twenty sermons on the great themes of the Gospel. They are full of excellent sermon matter and would be a valuable guide to any preacher who was lecturing through the Gospel, while for the devout reader they will be found to be rich in spiritual nourishment. The price of the volumes is 3s. 6d. each.

Father Robert Eaton of the Birmingham Oratory presents to Roman Catholic readers in *The Apocalypse of St. John* (Sands; 3s. 6d.) an exposition of the Book of the Revelation which will be found useful by those who would like to have an intelligent grasp of ‘the most mysterious book in the whole Bible’ (to quote from the Preface by Professor T. E. Bird of Oscott College, Birmingham) but cannot afford time for prolonged study. Each chapter or section is set down in English translation, and followed by a simple commentary, in which the homiletical note is sometimes sounded. The commentary is clearly written, and shows due appreciation of the symbolical character of the text. In its preparation the commentaries of Protestant as well as Catholic writers have been used.

The ‘Catholic Library of Religious Knowledge’ is to consist of one hundred volumes of modern French



theological works translated by the Benedictine Fathers of Talacre. We have received two items of the series. One is *The Church of the Early Centuries*, by the Abbé Amann. It is well written and well translated save that 'Dionysius' is rather unrecognizable as 'Denis,' and *circelliones* does not seem right. For its size (two hundred and forty-two pages) the book is wonderfully comprehensive; and in the facts adduced is accurate. With some of the inferences, of course, a Protestant scholar will strongly differ.

The other volume is *Mediæval Spirituality*, by Professor Felix Vernet. It is a compendious account of the works of devotional writers. The first portion reads rather like an annotated catalogue; it will be to many a revelation of an unknown wealth of devotional writing. The second part is of great interest, giving a brief exposition of the works, with many quotations under appropriate headings.

Both books—no doubt for practical reasons—are much too compressed and suffer thereby. It is particularly distressing that in works of such a kind there should be no room for bibliography or index. The publishers are Messrs. Sands & Co., and the price is 3s. 6d. net each.

*St. Paul and his Teaching* (Sands; 3s. 6d. net) consists of five lectures delivered at Aberdeen, 1928-29, under the auspices of the Aberdeen Diocesan Branch of the Catholic Truth Society of Scotland. The editor, the Rev. C. Lattey, S.J., M.A., contributes a Preface and the concluding Lecture on the Second Coming. The other contributors are the Rev. C. A. Corbishley, the Rev. Alphonsus Bonnar, the Rev. R. A. Knox, and the Rev. T. E. Bird, who write respectively on the Life and Letters of St. Paul, the Divinity of Christ, the Church, and the Holy Eucharist. All the contributors are or have been Professors in Roman Catholic Colleges in England.

The first Lecture is crisp and well-balanced, and provides a good introduction to the study of St. Paul's mind and thought on the themes that follow. One notices with interest that in the first three Lectures the Pauline authorship of Hebrews is affirmed or assumed, but that in the fourth Lecture it appears to be allowed that the Epistle may not have come direct from the hand of St. Paul, but is Pauline only in its doctrine. The second Lecture denounces Kenoticism in all its forms as endeavouring 'to undermine Catholic dogma relating to Christ.' It appears to us, however, that Kenoticists are, generally speaking, loyal to the Christological

tradition; it is their very loyalty to it that has motivated their theological speculation. The third Lecture apparently assumes that in the traditional Protestantism with its doctrine of the Church invisible there is no place given to the doctrine of the visible Church. The fourth Lecture contends very dogmatically that the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist is to be found in St. Paul's teaching, while the fifth is hard put to it in seeking to reduce St. Paul's teaching on the general resurrection to consistency. While we make such critical comments, we appreciate the ability of the Lectures, and in particular the evidence they show that Roman Catholic apologists keep in touch with the literature of what claims to be progressive theology.

A thoroughly scholarly work has been written on the analysis of Gospel sources and its results for the interpretation of the Gospel story—*Christ in the Gospels*, the Hale Lectures for 1929-30, by Burton Scott Easton, S.T.D., Professor of New Testament Interpretation in the General Theological Seminary, New York (Scribner's; 7s. 6d. net). We know Professor Easton from previous admirable volumes of New Testament study, but he has written nothing better than the present book. Its main features may be briefly described. After the most complete literary analysis of the Synoptists, we have still to discover the nature of the tradition that lay behind the documents and to decide with what accuracy this represents the original events. Perhaps this is the most pressing problem of New Testament scholarship to-day. Professor Easton faces it boldly in the book before us. He concludes that Jesus had a double doctrine of salvation based on the double estimate of Himself. He was the final prophet, and His message was the Fatherhood. But He was also the final Deliverer, and His task was the bringing in of the Kingdom. This was the Apocalyptic aspect of His work and lay in the future, beyond the grave. This is a very inadequate summary of the trend of this engrossing study. There is a close analysis of sources, and there is a penetrating effort to pierce to the secret of the mission of Jesus. And, even if we do not see eye to eye with the writer in all things, we are grateful for the stimulus and enlightenment that are to be found on every page.

Messrs. Seeley, Service & Co. have added to their volumes of exploration an elaborate and fully illustrated narrative of *The Island Builders of the Pacific* (21s. net). The author is Mr. Walter G. Ivens,

Litt.D., F.R.G.S., and this book is the result of his research work on the island called Big Mala, one of the Solomon Islands group of the Pacific off the coast of Queensland, for the University of Melbourne. He spent the months of June to October 1927 in a Christian village on this island, about a hundred miles long by thirty in breadth, with a population of between fifty and sixty thousand, most of whom live on the hills away from the coast. His special object was to investigate the manners and customs of the natives on artificial islands of their own construction only a few hundred yards distant from the coast. These people are still heathen and, except for changes made in their culture and habits by the coming of white traders and planters, their life has altered very little during the last fifty years. Dr. Ivens has made the fullest investigation into all their customs, and these he describes with the utmost elaboration. Fishing in the lagoon is the main occupation of the men, who build their own canoes and make their own nets. The women also are experts in handling the canoes, and the children have no fear of the sea.

No book has had so romantic a history as the Bible. That story has often been told, but surely never more entrancingly than by Dr. James Baikie, F.R.A.S., in the book which he has aptly entitled *The Romance of the Bible* (Seeley, Service; 6s. net), and which is adorned with many beautiful illustrations. The book reads as if a friendly voice were actually speaking to us in simple, musical, and winsome words, with a strangely compelling power. Dr. Baikie goes back to the making of the Old Testament, and traces the story down to the Bible of to-day, showing at every turn a wonderful power of selecting fascinating incidents to illustrate that story and of telling them in a fascinating way. Incidentally the book is a fine introduction to the study of history, as it shows how intimately the story of the Bible and of the nations is intertwined. The writer is obviously a Protestant of the Protestants. While scrupulously fair to Roman Catholicism, he can write very scathingly of 'the utter mercilessness of Rome in her hour of power.' Dr. Baikie dwells lovingly on the story of the Covenanters in words that will stir more especially the Scottish heart. Alike by the beauty of its style and by the warmth with which the story is told, the book is a pure joy, and, whether for young or old, we could not imagine a more appropriate present.

The latest of the lavishly illustrated series of

travel guides published by Seeley, Service & Co. is *Things Seen in Portugal* (3s. 6d. net). These pocket guide-books, about forty in number, written by competent authorities, are not only admirably planned for the information of the prospective or actual tourist, but the armchair tourist will find himself or herself transported forthwith to foreign parts, and enabled to spend most agreeably and profitably the leisure hours of an evening. One can imagine the tourist passenger by the Sud Express, bound on the journey to Oporto and Lisbon, improving the time with this guide in deciding where to go and what to see, and finding his expectations more than realized. The guide is M. F. Smithes, and in knowledge of the country and in sympathy with its people is one who will command the attention of the tourist and the reader.

*The Gospel Foundations*, by Bishop John Stephen Hart (S.P.C.K.; 5s. net), is the Moorhouse Lectures for 1928. These lectures deal chiefly with the character of Mark's Gospel and the historicity of John's. Bishop Hart is refreshingly independent in judgment and takes a line of his own quite out of the beaten track. His contention is that Mark was written as early as A.D. 43, and therefore not at Rome but probably at Antioch where it may well have become known to St. Paul. Side by side with Mark, John is placed as a 'foundation Gospel.' Two chapters are devoted to 'an attempt to show that its narratives are trustworthy, that as a rule they are complementary to St. Mark, and that where there is divergence it is at least as likely as St. Mark to be correct.' This brief summary, of course, gives no idea of the painstaking scholarship and careful reasoning with which Bishop Hart supports his conclusions. If not always convincing, they are worthy of respectful consideration, and New Testament scholars will find here much that provides food for thought and may lead in some instances to a revision of theories.

Miss G. B. Ayre, J.P., has followed up her 'Suggestions for a Syllabus in Religious Teaching' by a book in which she carries out her own suggestions—*A Course of Religious Teaching*, being a syllabus with notes for teachers for senior, central, and the lower forms of secondary schools (S.C.M.; 2s. 6d. net). In the first volume (now published) she gives us a syllabus for two years. In the first year we have St. Mark's Gospel, the Early Church (Ac 1-12), and the Old Testament story from Abraham to Elijah. In the second are the Life and Letters of St. Paul, the Prophets, and St. Luke's



Gospel. The method is by way of paraphrase or expansion of the narrative, with much new knowledge worked in unobtrusively. There are general introductions and suggestions for individual work. It is all well done, and will be found helpful and suggestive by teachers, though they will probably find the need of something more detailed. Miss Ayre has, however, furnished a list of books for further study which will supplement her own admirable material. A second volume is to follow, dealing with more advanced studies, such as the Old Testament as literature, and the structure of the New Testament. We commend this present instalment heartily to the teaching profession.

The general editor of 'The Library of Contemporary Thought,' Dr. W. Tudor Jones, has himself written *Contemporary Thought of Germany*, vol. i. (Williams & Norgate; 5s. net). This is to be followed by a second volume in which he hopes 'to amplify many points which had to be left out of the present volume.' Even so, two volumes of moderate size are but small space in which to

give account of the vast and varied streams of German philosophic and religious thought. In this volume, after a preliminary chapter dealing with the sources of modern German philosophy, Dr. Jones goes on to treat of Kantianism and Neo-Kantianism, Hegelianism, Philosophy and the Sciences, Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, Phenomenology, and the Religious à Priori school. If one were to offer a criticism it would be that in an endeavour to be exhaustive Dr. Jones tends to overburden the history with names. The result is that in many cases a brief paragraph is devoted to some writer who might perhaps have been better omitted to make room for fuller treatment of the greater men. This, of course, is a point on which judgments will differ. Dr. Jones is to be congratulated on the success, thus far, of an exceedingly complex and difficult work, which gives evidence on every page of care and industry, of competent scholarship and independent thought, and which reveals great skill in the articulation of its various parts. The book will be found valuable alike for general reading and for reference.

## The Star Hêlêl, Jupiter?

BY PROFESSOR S. H. LANGDON, M.A., PH.D., OXFORD.

THE well-known prophecy of Isaiah against Babylon (Is 13-14) contains many lines that are parallel to the terrible threats made against Babylon by the underworld deity Nergal-Irra in the myth known as *šar gimir dadmê*, 'king of all habitations.' The fragments of this Babylonian legend have been edited by Erich Ebeling, *Der akkadische Mythos vom Pestgott Ira*. Irra for some reason, although advised by his messenger Ishum to have mercy upon men, was enraged by their righteousness, and says that they are protégés of Marduk, and threatens to destroy Babylon and cause Marduk to depart from his throne and descend to the inaccessible Apsû or nether-world ocean. Marduk reminds him of a previous occasion when, by the hostility of this terrible enemy of gods and men, he left his throne in Babylon, and sent the Flood, which all but destroyed men. Marduk, however, agrees to leave his throne, and a second disaster comes upon the world. In later parts of the epic Irra is again found to be plotting the total destruction of Babylon, and also of Erech. The passages containing these

dire afflictions, which he foretells and which resemble so closely the prophecies of Isaiah against Babylon, are the following:

- (1) E. Ebeling, *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur Religösen Inhalts*, No. 169, Obv. iv. 21-Rev. i. 5.

Irra, speaking to his messenger Ishum, says:

'The days are ended, the fixed time is past.'

Cf. Is 13<sup>a</sup>, 'Wail ye; for the day of Yāw is at hand, as the might from the mighty one shall enter,' and 13<sup>2b</sup>, 'And her time is at hand to enter, and her days shall not be continued.'

- (2) *Ibid.* No. 169, Rev. iii., restored by K. 2619 Rev. i. = *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, ii. 485. See Ebeling, *Mythus vom Pestgott Ira*, p. 30 ll. 1-47. Restorations from VAT, 11486 (unpublished), by Ebeling.

Ishum now agrees to execute the orders of Irra and destroy Babylon.

'Irkalla I will shake, and the heavens shall tremble.'

Cf. Is 13<sup>13</sup>, 'Therefore will I make the heavens to tremble, and the earth shall waver from her place.'

Irra myth:

'The son will I cause to die, and his father shall bury him, and then the father will I cause to die, and he shall have none to bury him.'

Cf. Is 14<sup>19</sup>, 'But thou art cast forth from thy sepulchre like an abominable branch.'

Other comparisons between these passages of the Irra myth and the prophecy of Is. (13-14<sup>23</sup>) can easily be made. Whether this prophecy actually belongs to the original work of the Hebrew prophet is hardly affected by the Assyrian parallel. The passage of the Assyrian poem which seems to prove that the Hebrew writer knew the Irra myth and made use of it in writing his own denunciation of Babylon is the following:

'The brilliance of the god Shulpae will I cause to fall, and the stars will I cause to be suppressed.'<sup>1</sup>

The god Shulpae is a well-known title of Marduk, and the planet Jupiter is regularly named Shulpae from the Sumerian period<sup>2</sup> and in all periods of Babylonian and Assyrian history. The passage in the Irra myth, where it occurs in prophecy against Babylon, undoubtedly refers to Jupiter the planet of Marduk-Bêl, the god of Babylon. It is, therefore, probable that Isaiah refers to the same planet in the parallel prophecy against Babylon and its king:

'How art thou fallen from heaven, O Hêlêl, son of the morning? Thou art cut down to the ground, which didst lay low (?) the nations.'

It is customary to correct the Massoretic word Hêlêl to Hêlâl, to which the meaning 'brightness' is assigned, and then, after the Septuagint rendering *ὁ ἑωσφόρος*, to translate 'Lucifer, son of the morning.' An astronomical text of the seventh century B.C. gives three names for Jupiter according to his altitude in the sky at sunrise. In each case Jupiter is called the star of Marduk. At its heliacal rising Jupiter is called Shulpae, when it is two (?) hours high it is called Saggemgar, and when it stands at the zenith it is called Nîbiru, 'the passing.'<sup>3</sup> There is, therefore, no reason why Shulpae should

not be called 'son of the morning,' or, as the Septuagint translates, *ὁ πρῶτος ἀνατέλλων*, 'rising early.' Is there, then, any Babylonian word, which rendered the Sumerian term Shulpae, and from which Hêlêl could have been borrowed? In the Persian period Jupiter has uniformly the Sumerian name *mulu-babbar*, which passed into Greek as *Μολοβοβαρ*, i.e. 'star of the sun,' since Marduk was a sun-god.<sup>4</sup> The sign UD (babbar) with values *dag*, *had*, *hud*, *ra* is rendered by the Babylonian word *ellu*, and the title *ilu ellu*, 'the bright god,' is repeatedly used of Shamash, the sun-god, and of Marduk.<sup>5</sup> In fact, the principal Sumerian name of Marduk, Asarludug, is explained by the Babylonians of the late period as *ilu ellu mullil alakti-ni*, 'Bright god who brightens our way.'<sup>6</sup>

In this passage the great gods are speaking; it is they who gave Marduk his names, and they undoubtedly refer to Marduk as the sun-god who lights the paths of the planets and constellations with which the gods had been identified.

It is, therefore, the *late* title of Marduk as Jupiter which may have been understood by the Babylonian title *ilu ellu*. The Hebrews would have borrowed *ellu* in the construct form *êlil*, which, following the analogy of the Sumerian loan-word *ekallu*, 'great house,' temple, palace, Hebrew *Hêkâl*, would be transcribed Hêlêl. 'The bright one,' *ellu*, may well be the ordinary Babylonian adjective for Jupiter, 'son of the morning.' In any case, the similarity of the passages of the Irra myth, in which Jupiter stands for the god of Babylon, to the prophecy of Isaiah in which Hêlêl stands for the king of Babylon, supplies a strong argument for supposing that Hêlêl is really a Babylonian loan-word for Jupiter or Marduk. If my argument is not defective, two conclusions are necessary: (1) The Massoretic pointing is right, and no Hebrew word *hêlâl* exists. (2) Is 13-14<sup>23</sup> seems to belong to the Persian period, if *ellu* is based upon the Sumerian name of Jupiter *mulu-babbar* and not upon Shulpae, whose literal meaning is *îlu šûrû*, 'the glorified hero.' If, however, the well-known title *ilu ellu* for Marduk-Jupiter is independent of both Sumerian titles, then no argument for or against the authenticity of Isaiah's prophecy against Babylon can be made on this ground. The texts of the Irra myth which we actually possess from Assur are certainly as old as or older than

<sup>1</sup> KAR, 169. p. 312, 29=BA, ii. 487. 1.

<sup>2</sup> The name of the god Shulpae occurs in the Fara texts before 3000 B.C. (A. Deimel, *Die Inschriften von Fara*, ii. No. 5, Rev. iii. 4; No. 6, Obv. iv. 5).

<sup>3</sup> R. C. Thompson, *Astrological Reports*, 94, Obv. 7-Rev. 1.

<sup>4</sup> See Kugler, *Sternkunde*, i. 12-13.

<sup>5</sup> For *ilu el-lum*=Marduk, see Hehn, *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, ii. 360, K. 8961, 2.

<sup>6</sup> Langdon, *Epic of Creation*, 186. 133-4.



the eighth century, in the last part of which Isaiah lived. The Irra myth seems to have been well known to the author of 13-14<sup>23</sup>. If the chapters be placed after the Exile, of course only a Persian king can be referred to, and this is clearly improbable. Into this problem it is not my province

to enter. I cannot see how any Babylonian king of the age of Isaiah could be considered as suited to the description in these chapters. Nabunidus, the last king, seems to be the only one who suits the various details of the Hebrew and Babylonian texts.

---

## The Measure of a Man.

BY THE REVEREND JAMES B. JOHNSTON, B.D., FALKIRK.

WHEN a preacher has been preaching for many years, for him to light upon a good, new text that has never offered itself before, is a great find—treasure-trove. Such was my lot a little while ago, in course of my morning Bible reading when on holiday. This verse, 'The desire of a man is his kindness' (Pr 19<sup>23</sup>), I must have read before, so surely must you, my readers. I wonder if you, like me, have never until now stopped to think what it meant. The words sound so simple; but what do they mean? They both puzzled and intrigued me. Of course I was away from all books, and could only guess. My first thought was, perchance *kindness* here occurs in its old-fashioned, original sense = *kinship*. Kindness is literally, showing what kind you are of, what is your birth, who are your kin. And I thought the proverb might mean, The things a man desires reveal, form an excellent index to, what is in him. They show the stuff he is made of, the true company to which he belongs. You can learn a great deal from a man's most eagerly or frequently expressed desires, be it for money, or praise, or a quiet hour in a little nook with a little book, be it for hard work or for sport. The desire unveils the inner man, his 'kind.'

However, when I got back to my study, I soon found my first notion was wrong. Kindness here is just what the plain man means by it, or, rather, something more and better. The word here is the Hebrew *hesedh*, one of the commonest words in the OT, one of the richest and most beautiful too. It usually refers to God, His mercy, grace, and love, not only kindness but loving-kindness, sweet and free. When used of a man it is meant to cover all that in which man at his best can show himself likest God, all that which makes a man most lovable, attractive, desirable. So one meaning possible

for our text—it is that in the RV margin—is, 'That which maketh a man to be desired, or sought after, is his kindness,' the charity he shows, the gifts he gives, the kindly words he is wont to speak. And surely, if we wish to be desired, sought after, plainly popular, you and I would rather have it for our natural and genuine kindness than merely for our money or our patronage or our power to give a friend a lift up, be he deserving or no. Yet some of us would be rather sorry if that were the only possible meaning of this Bible proverb. The Proverbs are supposed to be the quintessence of wisdom, usually with some whiff of Divine breath, of God's Spirit, blowing through it. Now, to be desired and run after simply for what we are going to give, the benefits we are expected to bestow, is not a very high or honourable platform to have reached. The highest, verily, lies not there. No class of people are more despised in Eastern lands than 'rice Christians,' the people who profess to follow Christ only for what they can make out of it.

But, as I continued my studies, I soon found several other possible meanings, each interesting, each yielding food for thought; though I fear I may confuse or bewilder if I try to give them all. Perhaps for once you may like to join a minister in his study, while he examines a text from every possible side. When I looked at the Hebrew I saw at once that our AV gives the exact and literal rendering. But, as we have seen, that does not take us far. What does the verse mean? The Greek of the Seventy says, 'Compassion (or mercy) brings fruit to a man.' Dr. Moffatt is evidently of this mind. He renders: 'Friendliness bears fruit for a man.' In other words, you never lose in the end by being kind. That is very true. You may be too hard, too grasping, but, in this world, you

cannot be too liberal, too merciful, too generous. Before you are done you will always get back your own with interest, through the blessing of God, if not always through the expressed thanks of man. Friendliness does bear fruit, sweet, refreshing fruit. True, but I could not persuade myself that that is what our proverb means; so I still pursued my search. I looked next at the Vulgate, the Latin version, the great Bible of the Roman Catholic Church. It says: 'A needy (*indigens*) man, a man full of desires and lackings, is merciful.' In more familiar words, 'It is the poor that help the poor.' Only the man who always has many things he is compelled to desire, only the poor man can fully sympathize with the poor, or show to his poor brother the tender consideration he needs. There is a great deal of truth there. Only when our own shoe pinches do we, as a rule, begin to think of the pinching shoes of others. 'A fellow-feeling makes us wondrous kind.' But it is a shame that any one should let himself think, a meaner shame that any should grudge to think, that rich men and women often show very warm and hearty sympathy too. But once more I felt, I must say, the truth of our proverb does not lie here.

Another interpretation must at least be mentioned. The great Jewish Rabbis seem to hold that our text means: 'The ornament of a man is his kindness'; which is also quite true. But the Hebrew dictionary gives no countenance to our taking *desire* as = *ornament*. They do not look very like each other, do they? Some of us would have plenty of ornaments if every desire of ours helped to make a necklace. So we come finally to the translation in the RV: 'The desire of a man is the measure of his kindness.' The real estimate of our kindness is to be found in what we honestly and heartily desire to do, not in what we are always actually able to do. Here our old friend Matthew Henry comes to help us out. He tells us how, 'surely, 'tis a laudable ambition to wish to be kind.' Every man with a spark of virtue in him will at least desire to be kind, even though too poor or weak to do all he fain would. If ever it were

lawful to break the tenth commandment it would be, when we desired more wealth or gear that we might help others and succour their distress. Better have a heart to do good and lack ability to do it, than have the ability and lack the heart. Good wishes are always something. By both our Maker and our marrow it is accepted according as a man hath; and both will give us credit, if plainly we desire to do more, though we cannot.

This helps us to understand the rather strange sequel to our text: 'And a poor man is better than a liar,' *i.e.* the poor yet good man, who does his very best and longs to do more, is far better than the rich man, who makes all manner of fine promises which he never performs, but proves false, and leaves us, it may be, sadly in the lurch.

Take, then, this teaching home to-day. God measures us, and so do men, by the desires to do good and be kind, which they see welling up in our hearts, or, by the total lack of such in those icebergs which some folk seem to have instead of a heart. Genuine desires are seeds bound to bear fruit. It is always good to be sowing seeds of kindness. Let us see we stifle them not, shackling our generosity and straining hard the quality of mercy. Rather let us seek that it be ever said of us as of the *Virtuous Woman* in Pr 31, 'The law of kindness is on her tongue.' Time flies so fast, life is so short, we have not time for much more than to be kind while we may. Chances shoot past us all too quick, if they be not seized as they go by. 'Kindness,' however, so we are told, 'is a language even the dumb can speak and the deaf understand.' Wealth and learning are all very good in their own way; but we get nearest God when we are kind. The late Professor W. G. Elmslie was one of the most brilliant Hebrew professors Britain has ever seen. Yet perhaps as high a compliment as was ever paid him was that of an old Scots wife: 'Ye ken hoo to be kind and couthy wi' a puir auld body.' If we try to be that too, we shall be growing a little liker Jesus, the 'kind above all others,' in whom, as St. Paul wrote to Titus, 'the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared.'



## The Wailing Wall at Jerusalem.

BY THE REVEREND W. M. CHRISTIE, D.D., MOUNT CARMEL BIBLE SCHOOL, HAIFA.

THE Wailing Wall of the Jews, so prominent before the world to-day, consists of part of the Circumvallation of the Temple Court. The great stones forming the lower rows of this wall may go back to the time of Solomon, and if the adjoining 'Solomon's Stables' be genuine, which we have the strongest reasons for believing, then this building, too, dates from the time of Israel's wise king. It is named by the Jews the 'Kotel Maarabi,' or 'Western Wall,' and only by Gentile onlookers has it been associated with 'wailing,' and that because the Jew recites there, along with other items of ritual, the Book of Lamentations, very often in a loud voice.

### THE PRAYER DIRECTION.

Solomon completed the Temple about the year 967 B.C., and we have his Dedication Prayer in 1 K 8. He goes over the varied circumstances in prospect in the nation's future life, and on each occasion indicates that prayer is to be 'toward this house,' thus consecrating it as the Central Shrine of Israel's faith and worship. The captive in Babylon sang, 'If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, may my right hand forget' (Ps 137<sup>5</sup>), and in harmony with this, as also with the injunction of Solomon, we find that Daniel in 538 B.C., 'prayed three times a day,' 'his windows being open in his chamber toward Jerusalem.' While the Temple stood, the Jew very often, as did also the Apostles (Ac 3<sup>1</sup>), went up thither at the hours of prayer. The Women's Court was in reality a synagogue, accessible to all Israelites, but with the special provision of a gallery for the women. And everywhere from the earliest days of ordered ritual till our own day, the Israelite has begun his Morning Service, 'I will worship toward thy Holy Temple.'

### CHANGES WITH DESTRUCTION OF TEMPLE.

Vespasian, Titus, and the Romans destroyed the Temple in A.D. 70. The Jewish State was at an end, and its Sacred Shrine was a heap of ruins. Conditions were changed, and for two separate reasons the pious Israelite could not enter the consecrated precincts. In the mass of ruins it was difficult to determine exactly the site of the Holy of Holies, and the worshipper might unwittingly tread upon, and profane that all-holy place. Then the Jew recognized that in terms of the Ceremonial

Law he was unclean, and that in such condition he could not enter the Courts of the Holy House. He thus became, in the first instance, self-excluded. An alteration, the smallest possible, then became necessary in connexion with the Central Shrine or the 'Prayer Direction,' and all the necessities of the case were met in the Western Wall.

### A BIBLE BASIS.

Divine sanction was found for the chosen site in the Song of Solomon 2<sup>9</sup>, where we read, 'Behold, he standeth behind our wall.' According to the spiritualizing method of interpretation of the Jews (and some Christians too) this was explained, 'The Western Wall, of which the Holy One, blessed be He, has sworn that it should never be destroyed.' We find this interpretation repeated again and again down through the ages. About A.D. 300, the famous Rabbi Acha mentions it in such a way as to show that it had been of long standing. It is repeated in 340 by another company in studying the Old Testament Scriptures. In 1300 Rabbi Shimeon Haddarshan, the reputed ancestor of the Adler family, gives the same account in his great work, called Yalkut. And in my possession I have a valuable document, dated 1871, signed by twelve Jerusalem rabbis, and certified by three synagogue seals, in which the writers declare to the ambassadors they send out on their behalf, that they will pray for them 'these three prayers, Evening, Morning, and Midday, to the God of the Gate of the Holy Place, this Gate of Heaven, before the Shechinah, Our Strength, "Behold, this One is standing behind our wall," the Kotel Maarabi, our prayers shall be directed.'

### CONTEMPORARY PRACTICE.

This interpretation seems to have been put into practice from the very first. About A.D. 75 we read of Jochanan ben Zakkai (almost certainly the John of Ac 4<sup>6</sup>), Head of the Sanhedrin (Great Council), visiting Jerusalem, evidently for devotional purposes, and meeting the daughter of a Nicodemon ben Gurion, whom some take for Nicodemus. Twenty years later we have a case that is quite certain, and in which we have every indication that the Western Wall was the site visited. Gamaliel II., Akiba, and other rabbis visited the Holy City. When they came in sight

of the ruins they rent their clothes. They passed the site of the Holy of Holies, and saw a fox creep out of the ruins. All the rabbis wept, but Akiba manifested signs of joy. Why this unseemly conduct? He explained that he saw there the fulfilment of the threatening prophecies against Israel, and that gave him the assurance that the glorious promises would also find fulfilment. They must have passed by the western side of the ruins of the Temple; they passed farther south than the site of the Holy of Holies, and that led them exactly to the position of the present Wailing Wall. In the first tract of the Talmud, we have the story of Rabbi Jose going from Galilee to pray among the ruins, and of his experiences there. This was about A.D. 150. Rabbi Levi (c. A.D. 350) tells us of the joy of the pilgrims in the days of the Temple and of the silence now. And the same is recounted by Rabbi Berechiah about the year A.D. 1200.

#### EARLY CHRISTIAN TESTIMONY.

But we are not dependent on Jewish testimony alone. It is true that the Christians resident in the land, as well as pilgrims who came from abroad, cared little for things Jewish, and too often left them unnoticed. Still, the evidence from this source bears out all we learn from the Jews, and they are weighty as coming from men of distinction all of different race and mental outlook. In A.D. 333 the Pilgrim of Bordeaux records that the Jews were allowed to visit for prayer and weeping 'the pierced stone.' We think there is a little confusion here and that for 'pierced' we should read 'memorial.' The difference is that 'q' has been heard for 'k.' This is a frequent source of error in all the Semitic languages. Jerome (340-420) tells us that the Jews were not permitted to enter the city except for the purposes of wailing, and he indicates they had for this to pay a price—an early indication of bribery to local officials. Gregory of Nazianzen (a Syrian) in one of his sermons gives the same story. And in harmony with all these we have the account given by Eusebius, the famous Church Historian of Cæsarea, who lived in the same century.

#### IN THE MIDDLE AGES.

In mediæval times the whole life and literature of the Jewish world were touched by the associations of the Western Wall. Many allusions might be found to it in both the Babylonian and Spanish-Jewish literatures, but a few direct references must suffice. Poets sang of it, and pilgrims went through dangers and hardships to visit it.

Jehudah Hallevi, who died on his journey to Jerusalem in A.D. 1040, has given us his beautiful *Songs of Zion*, the finest Hebrew poetry produced since the days of the great psalmists, and from one of his songs we translate literally:

Would that one might give me the wings of eagles,  
That I might moisten with my tear thy dust,  
Shall I not take pleasure in thy stones and kiss them?  
And the taste of thy clods shall be sweeter to me than  
honey,

There the Shechinah dwells for thee,  
And thy Creator has opened thy gates,  
Against the gates of the sky,  
I will choose for my soul to be companion in the place  
Where the Spirit of God is poured upon thy chosen  
ones,

I will fall with my face upon the ground,  
I will take pleasure in thy stones,  
And thy dust will be dear unto me.

Benjamin of Tudela, a Spanish Jew, who journeyed in the interests of trade and geographical science, records, under A.D. 1163, that 'in front of it (the Mosque of Omar) you see the Western Wall, one of the walls which formed the Holy of Holies of the Ancient Temple; it is called the Gate of Mercy, and all the Jews resort thither to say their prayers near the wall of the courtyard' (Bohn's Edition, p. 83).

Estor Parchi, a Spanish traveller in the interests of antiquarian research, in 1322; and Meshullam of Volterra (1481) also give testimony, the latter mentioning specially the 9th of Ab, the anniversary of the Fall of Jerusalem.

In 1495 Rabbi Obadiah of Bertinora, who became Chief Rabbi of Jerusalem, and died in 1520, sets down in one of his Letters the following: 'In the midst of the city, near to the Holy House, there is a place, open and empty, to which the community after prayer resorts, that they may pray opposite the Holy House, for from there they see the Holy and Fearful Place.'

#### IN TURKISH DAYS.

These began in A.D. 1517 when the Turks took Jerusalem from the Egyptian Arabs. The evidences are few, but the reason is there was no question. It is said that Selim I. granted the Wailing Wall by Charter (Firman) to the Jews. We have not been able to trace it yet, but this is just the kind of thing such a man would do in the circumstances. At any rate we can say that, apart from the tyranny of one brutal pasha in 1625, there seems to have been peace for three centuries, and literature flourished in the Jewish cities.

In 1640, however, we read in another Letter a



confirmation of all that has been said of Jewish practice, and there is further added a note concerning the Ritual of the Wailing Wall, which shows revision from time to time. Once again there was a revision in Turkish days of the same ritual, when at the beginning of the nineteenth century Rabbi Samuel issued his *Gate of Tears*, which under different names has been published in Jerusalem.

#### MORE THAN A SHRINE OF PRAYER.

That the Western Wall was not exclusively a centre of prayer, but could be used, and was used, for other kindred purposes we have ample evidence. During the invasion of Egypt and Palestine by Napoleon in 1798, the Jews were suspected of favouring his cause, and of being desirous to help him in his conquests, and accordingly they were threatened with death. In response to this they gathered under the leadership of Mordechai Elgazi, at the Western Wall for prayer and protest. Their action seems to have been effectual in warding off the danger.

In 1856 the Reformed Jews made their first efforts in the East by opening a school in Jerusalem. This was too much for the Orthodox party, and, as on the former occasion, they gathered for Prayer and protest at the Wailing Place.

In 1882 (Ab, 5642), according to a Hebrew newspaper cutting in my hand, Jerusalem was visited by Albert Edward, Prince of Wales, and was received by the Chief Rabbi Chayyim David Chazzan, and all the leading Jews at the Western Wall. He questioned the rabbi as to the antiquity of the buildings, and was assured that they were from the time of Solomon. The rabbi then raised his hands and prayed for the 'Peace of Queen Victoria, Queen of Great Britain, and Empress of India, that her days might be long over her kingdom, and that perfectly she might rule in wisdom and righteousness.'

#### RESTRICTIONS AND HINDRANCES.

We are generally given to understand that on the Fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 the Jews were forbidden by Titus to approach the Holy City. We have been unable to trace any such regulation, and, on the contrary, the evidences we have already given show that the ruins were partially occupied. We also read of Arabs with their camels in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, clearly engaged in trade.

It was probably after the movements in the Jewish world in A.D. 115-117 that hostile laws were

made, and then the threat to create a Roman colony with a heathen temple in place of that ruined by Titus, roused the Jewish world, and brought disaster especially with Barcochab's Fall (c. 135). Then many things were forbidden—Circumcision, the Sabbath, Study of the Law, Ordination of Rabbis, and that the Jews should approach Jerusalem. But with the death of Hadrian (A.D. 138) there came a great modification, if not a complete abolition of these laws. We have, on the other hand, many stories of a great friendship between his successor, Antoninus Pius, and the Patriarch of the Jews—Rabbi Jehudah Hakkodesh.

We have noticed the restrictions that are recorded in the fourth century. They seem to have been determined by the fancies of the local rulers, or perhaps rather their desires to bleed a helpless and despised people. We have no very definite information as to what happened on the Advent of Islam and the passing of Jerusalem unto the hands of the Arabs in A.D. 636. The evidences we have been able to trace are seven hundred years too late, and besides they are contradictory. Bar Hebræus, a Christian of Jewish descent (ob. 1286), says that the Christians made terms with Omar for the exclusion of the Jews from Jerusalem. On the contrary, Isaac Chelo (fl. 1333) asserts that the exact site of the ancient temple was pointed out to Omar by an aged Jew, and that the payment made for this service was the preservation of the Western Wall. We are inclined to accept the latter as more correct, for very soon thereafter Omar manifested a peculiar confidence in the Jews, in entrusting them with the making of the first Arabic coinage. We have indicated the probable conditions following the Advent of the Turk. He received in the Turkish cities around the Ægean Sea multitudes of the fugitives from Spain, and treated them kindly. The same took place in Palestine, and the descendants of some of these immigrants, still bearing their Spanish names, occupy the holy cities to-day. Under the tyranny of avaricious pashas and cruel underlings, they had to live, and were both as communities and as individuals freely bled. At times, too, they were raided and robbed by Arabs and Druzes, but on the whole their lot was a comparatively happy one as compared with that in the lands whence they came, and in the very worst days we never hear an echo of a doubt regarding the Wailing Wall.

#### TURKISH TOLERATION.

But the attitude of the Turk, and indeed of the whole Moslem world, to the Jew in things that

pertained to the Wailing Wall, was kindly and tolerant, and official practice acknowledged his rights there perhaps more fully than any other religious right in Turkey was recognized. There was a strict censorship of all books printed in Turkey, or introduced through the custom houses. Christian religious papers were closely watched, and on the slightest grounds stopped or suppressed, while the censor sought to confiscate a book of my own because it contained the hymn, 'Hold the fort,' the remark being made, 'We do not allow people to hold forts in Turkey.' But notwithstanding all this strictness, the Ritual for the Wailing Wall was printed in numberless editions and forms in Jerusalem in Turkish days under the eye and direction of the censor. That revision of the Ritual might take place we have already indicated, but we are not aware of any alteration having been introduced during the present century. Indeed, just before these troubles commenced, we lent to a pious Jew for use at the Wall and elsewhere a copy of the Ritual printed in Turkish days.

The introduction to the prayer for the Western Wall recognizes both the individual worshipper, and also the Minyan, or synagogal group required for the conducting of a full synagogue service. We have seen in 1894, and on many occasions since, arrangements of benches, chairs, cushions, and carpets for the convenience of the worshippers, as well as individual devotees, and groups following a leader, and though we have never seen a screen ourselves, the testimony of others bears out its existence and use. And, besides, the segregation of men and women is in accord with the practice of all Eastern sects. During our presence at the Wall, the women occupied the north end and the men the southern, with a space between. Such, too, was my experience with even Arab Protestant Christians. For sixteen years in Aleppo, I tried to get the people to come and sit in the church 'as families.' Invariably I got a complaisant approval, but equally invariable was the practice carried out that the men sat on one side and the women on the other in the church. The Moslem world is careful about the segregation of the women. The question, 'How are your wife, daughters, or sisters?' is an impossible one from a genuine Moslem. Besides, the Moslem has a profound reverence for everything connected with prayer and worship. He would resent any intrusion himself, and as a rule he treats worshippers of every faith as he desires to be treated.

#### THE MIZRACHI PICTURES.

These, too, are an evidence of Turkish toleration, but their importance is so great that they must be considered by themselves. These are symbolical pictures, hung on the eastern (*mizrach*) wall in the home of every pious Jew throughout the world for the purpose of indicating the 'prayer direction' to which one must turn in every time of prayer. It generally presents Moses with the Two Tablets, and Aaron with a censer in his hand, while between them there appears a picture of the Western Wall, set forth as the Central Shrine of Israel's Faith, the place where Israel's God, and prophet, and priest are met. These pictures, printed in colour in various lands abroad, were being continually brought into Palestine in Turkish days, through the custom houses. They were allowed through centuries to pass freely, and no objection was ever raised. They were recognized as representing Israel's most sacred and exclusive shrine. The word 'rebellious' against the government was a very common one on the lips of avaricious officials in the old days, but it was never used of such pictures, though there was a fine opportunity here if the Moslem had any pretence to an interest in the Wailing Wall. Furthermore, the picture of the Western Wall forms part of some of the official synagogal seals in Jerusalem. These were used on documents as between the Jewish and the Ottoman authorities, and had Jewish claims been in doubt, the Jews would have been dealt with, as it would have been expressed in our law, for the assumption of 'false arms.' While speaking about pictures it may be worth while to mention that even the possession of a portrait of Mr. Gladstone was regarded by the Turks as a criminal offence.

#### ARAB PRETENSIONS.

These are so shadowy and indefinite that it is difficult to grasp them at all. They consist mainly in the assertion that this is also a sacred shrine of Islam, and that it is, and has been always named, 'The Buraq.' Neither Arabic nor Jewish literature supplies even an allusion to support such a claim. It was never the custom of Moslems to resort thither for prayer, and recent attempts to gather a company at the Wall for the Zikr Prayer are in themselves an innovation and violation of the *status quo*. Besides, we cannot imagine the Moslems sharing in any place or service religiously with the Jews. Exclusiveness in such matters is an undeviating Moslem characteristic. What about 'The Buraq'? This is the name given to the



imaginary winged horse on which Muhammad is supposed to have made 'the night journey' from Mecca to Jerusalem. On the rock within the Great Mosque they show to-day the mark of the hoof of the horse as struck by it on mounting for the return journey, and it was to this part of the Temple Court or Mosque of Omar that the designation was always given. The attempt to transfer the name to another site for evidence purposes can only be regarded as a proof of insincerity. But, as we have indicated, the claims made are quite modern, their ground is intangible, and the evidences are mere assertions.

#### CONCLUSION.

From the Fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 the Jew could not, and cannot, enter the Temple Court. As a substitute for that ancient shrine he has used all down through the past nineteen centuries the one accessible, convenient portion of the Western Wall. Through all the centuries his Claim of Right in that meeting-place as the Central Shrine of his Faith has been unchallenged. In times of local tyranny he was sometimes forbidden to approach

even the only well, and we learn of his being sometimes compelled to secure access by payment. There can be little doubt, however, that this was a despotic imposition, and if modern claims of this nature were made, it ought to be made very clear what was the nature of such a tax, and whither the money went. There seems to have been in former times a greater free space around the wall as indicated by our quotation from 1495. That seems to have been encroached upon, and it is worthy of note that the Moslems dwelling around, and who are playing so great a part in the movement, are themselves immigrants at their name, Magarabes, or Westerns, indicating they having come from various places in North Africa during the nineteenth century.

The Western Wall, or Wailing Place, is the most ancient and most sacred devotional shrine of the Jew. He possessed and worshipped at it centuries before Islam came into existence. He has a prescriptive right of nineteen centuries' duration in it, and what man can show a better claim than that to anything on earth? Every principle of righteousness and honour requires the recognition of his unique claim.

## In the Study.

### Virginitas Puerisque. A Temperance Talk.

By THE REVEREND F. J. ASHLEY, JOHANNESBURG.

'It biteth like a serpent.'—Pr 23<sup>32</sup>.

'Take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit.'—Eph 6<sup>17</sup>.

If we could get rid all at once of the things we don't like, how good life would be! There was a Roman emperor long ago who wished his enemies had but one neck so that he could kill them all with one blow. But then, he forgot one thing, that he would have had to kill himself as well, for he was his own worst enemy. He was an example of what we mean when we say that men's worst enemies are often their own desires, such as stealing, cheating, lying, gambling, and drunkenness. I want to talk about this last one, for he has been an enemy of man for ages and ages. So great and strong is he that we can't help wishing he had only one neck, and then, even if it were the neck of a dragon breathing fire, we could soon find a

George, or Patrick, or Ian, or David who would set out and make short work of him. But it is difficult to talk about enemies you can't see, and so in olden days, to help their imaginations, men gave forms to them. One of them all a Satan, who is the father of all sins; but nobody has seen even Satan walking about the streets, and so men thought of some terrible beast by which to describe him, and St. Peter tells us the devil is a roaring lion going about seeking victims to devour.

Here drink is likened to a snake, and that is a creature even more feared than a lion. 'Look out, a snake!' I don't know any cry that makes a man jump more. Most white people living in the wilds keep a snake-bite outfit handy, as thousands of people die from snake-bite every year. Remember it has been so for thousands of years, and then you can understand why it is instinctive with us to shudder when we see one, and why, when the old Hebrew writers wanted to tell how sin came into the world, they were sure it must have been through the creepiest and most cunning creature.

Else, why was the snake so feared and hated? You see, a lion or tiger or elephant is big enough to be seen, and you generally know when they're about; but a snake! It may be in the long grass, among the stones of a kopje, or curled round the branch of a tree, or under a bush, or anywhere; it may even get into a house unknown. And wherever it is it sees you first and is ready for you if you blunder on it.

The natives of Africa and India and South America, walking barefoot, are likely to step on snakes, and, being bare-headed, they are often struck from above. But they have even a more deadly enemy than snakes or lions, and that is strong drink. A wise old native once said to me, 'Drink is the snake in the grass for my people. It steals away their brains.' Now that sounds like a mixed metaphor, and if you wrote it at school in a composition exercise, it would probably lose you marks. Yet he knew what he was saying, for when a man is bitten he feels his brain going to sleep—the effect of the poison as it runs through his blood swiftly numbs him. And there could not be a better description of the nature of drink and the way it steals a man's senses, especially because, when he recovers from his stupor, he wants to take it again. He becomes its slave. Now a missionary friend of mine who grew up amongst African natives told me of a very interesting way his boy friends dealt with a very dreaded snake, the green mamba, a snake so deadly that it is a matter of honour to kill one whenever it is seen. Sometimes the boys would see one high up in a tree, and then they would hollow out a pumpkin, one would fit it tightly on his head like a helmet, take a stout stick in his hand and climb up towards the snake. The snake gets angry, of course, and sways its head about ready to strike, and then, as soon as he is within reach, the boy stretches up his head and the snake strikes! Just what the boy wanted it to do, for the fangs stick fast in the pumpkin and the snake is helpless. One blow of the stick, its back is broken and pumpkin and snake go hurtling to the ground, where the other boys, dancing and yelling, soon finish off the snake. Now, can you picture a better illustration of St. Paul's helmet of salvation and sword of the Spirit? The boy was armed for defence and attack, but I often marvel at the nerve of the first boy who tried that trick.

Every Christian should be armed for defence and attack, for Christianity is not merely dodging the things that may harm ourselves, but making our lives a crusade against evils that harm others.

### Rudders.

BY THE REVEREND S. GREER, M.A., AYC.

'My father, thou art the guide of my youth.'—Jer 34.

A funny thing, isn't it, that a rudder can make a huge liner go where it likes, and without a rudder it can't go anywhere.

That was what happened to the S.S. *Raa* some winters ago, and they had to send out a wireless warning to shipping: 'Dangerous to navigation. The *Raa* with engines still running. Position, four miles south of Folkestone.' The *Raa* had got into collision in the Channel, owing to the fog, and was abandoned by her crew. Unfortunately they forgot to stop her engines, so she went racing about the Channel, and the tugs which went out to take charge of her were unable to find her in the fog, and had to give up the search in case they should be rammed by this monster of the sea. By and by she fortunately sank. But you can imagine the horror of this ship, rushing through the water, her propellers whirling, yawing from one point of the compass to another, and all in a dense fog. Power in her engines, steam in her boiler, but no guiding hand on the helm. Here was power without direction, strength without control.

There is one man in the Old Testament whom that phrase just exactly describes—'strength without control'—'Samson' his mother called him, meaning 'The Sunny boy,' because I expect he lay in her arms with a smile which looked like a captive sunbeam, and gurgled with content. He grew up impulsive, overflowing with high spirits—killing a lion, and then making a joke of it. What energy there was in him, what untamed power, what roystering feats he carried through! But of control Samson had none. Power in the engine, fuel in the furnace, but, alas, no hand on the helm. One of the gladdest stories in the Bible, and one of the saddest.

What splendid powers there are in you young folk. How sure you are of yourselves! What uncurbed energy, mocking at barriers! What a sense of mastery, what adventurousness! How much you can make of life, and how far you can go—if you have a rudder. Now we fit rudders here, in church and Sunday school; big rudders for big folks, and little ones for little folk.

Some stupid people talk as if it were dull to keep always a straight course. They think it is more exciting to run loose, and go as they like. I wonder if they ever tried to steer a straight course on a river? If they did they wouldn't talk of



going straight as dull. Any one can yaw about from side to side, and bump into everybody. It takes a good man to go dead straight—keen eye, cool nerve, and a steady hand on the tiller.

There's a signal, given with two flags at the mast-head, which a ship flies when she enters a great river, and wants a pilot. Seeing that signal a boat darts out from the pilot-station, and presently the pilot is aboard, and the ship proceeds under his control. What about having the Lord Christ as your Pilot? What a sense of confidence you have when you feel His strong brave presence, and know that His hand is on your helm.

### The Christian Year.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

How what's in comes out.

'For there is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; and hid, that shall not be known.'—Mt 10<sup>26</sup>.

St. Paul speaks somewhere of 'the goodness and severity of God'; the Gospels leave upon our minds a sense of the goodness and severity of Jesus. For a long time now and very properly, we have all been dwelling upon those aspects of His teaching which are merely generous and benevolent. Or, if we recalled any words of His which are severe and threatening, they have been words which apply to those who act harshly towards their fellow-men, and so even those severe quotations strengthened the case for Christ's general benevolence. And yet, no one can read the Gospels without encountering words like that of our text which take us back to the Hebrew tradition of moral retribution, reminding us, with the tone of many a passage from the Psalms, that we live in a world where things are related one to another, actions to reactions, deeds to consequences, and thought to life.

These words become all the more serious when we perceive that our Lord in using them is not uttering a threat, but is simply stating a fact. A threat: why, that is something which we may avoid. Something may turn up in our favour to save us from consequences which, we may admit, are the usual consequences. Whether or not a mere threat will come true depends upon circumstances, upon time and chance, and any one of the necessary conditions may fail to act at the right moment, so that the work of retribution may be delayed for a time, or spoiled altogether. But it is quite different in the case of a fact. A fact is a fact. A fact is

a thing which has already happened, though we may have to wait for a time before we realize all that has happened.

In these severe words of Jesus, our Lord is saying in effect that what is in comes out; that we are all of us steadily becoming what all the time we are; that our deeper self is all the time gaining upon our more obvious self. We are apt to think that what we are becoming is the effect upon us of circumstances, but that is never quite the case. Before circumstances can have any decisive effect upon us something within ourselves must co-operate or assent.

When that wild man, Shimei, the son of Gera, cursed David and threw stones at him, it made Joab, who heard him, furious; but it made David, who also heard him, gentle. For a moment the voice of David took on the very tone which we hear on the lips of Stephen as he sank under the stones, the very tone of the voice of our Lord Himself, as His life ebbed from Him on the Cross. 'Let me go over and cut off that dog's head,' said Joab. 'No, no,' said David, 'let him alone. He is doing me good.' The difference in the two expressions had its source in the difference at the moment in the souls of the two men. In each case, what was in came out.

In the New Testament it is a frequent prayer, and forms one of the great benedictions, that Christ Himself would come and guard the heart and mind of those who are seeking to obey Him and to hold their ground in this actual world. And again and again an Apostle, writing to a group of Christian people, especially to those who have just begun their Christian life, will urge them to take care of their thoughts, promising that their actions will take care of themselves. And indeed an action is just a thought made visible. So we may even say that every day we live is a day of judgment for each of us; for it is a day of self-revelation. We can none of us help giving ourselves away. At the Final Judgment it may very well be that there will be no need for God to pronounce judgment upon us. Standing there we shall betray ourselves. And so Francis Thompson has a profound prayer that in the Great Assizes God may judge us not with our eyes but with His own.

It is quite true that we have all the power to a certain extent to check the tendency of our private life to betray itself. We may have sudden impulses which we may as suddenly control, driving them back into the chambers of our spirit. There are many influences round about us which help to keep our interior life in check, so that it expresses

itself as we choose it shall. But it is not a sound condition for any of us to be in when we have to rely upon our own second thoughts, or upon the retributions of society, to save us from ourselves. Surely the only honourable condition for a man to be in is that condition in which he has nothing within him to conceal, when the deepest and truest thing about him is something of such a kind that he would not mind the whole world knowing about it.

We know what a haunted life a man leads whose affairs rest upon no honourable and sound basis, whose good name in the eyes of the world is dependent upon the favour of this one and the silence of another, so that each day is occupied with plans and subterfuges for avoiding detection. That is not life at all; and the great dramas of the world's literature are so many cases to illustrate that rather than endure such a condition for more than a season a man will prefer to die. Like Ajax, he will ask for light, though he perish in the light.

It is a thing not to be questioned, further, that as we get older we lose the power of keeping back the true expression of ourselves. It may be, that as we get older we seem to ourselves to be beyond the reach of criticism. People, we suppose, have not the power now to harm us or to hinder us such as they had when we were younger. This may explain how it comes to pass that men are apt to break down not when they are climbing, but when they have reached the object of their ambition. But, quite apart from that, it is enough to remember that we all have ourselves as we use ourselves. If, in secret, we have been sowing to some lower way, later on the miserable harvest appears. Happily, the converse is also true. If in the days of our sowing, the days of strong passion, of ideals, of youth, when our nervous system, which is the body of our true spirit, was susceptible and creative—if in these days we maintained the good fight and contested with the devil every inch of space in those inner chambers, then at evening, it is promised, there shall be light.

Now and then we are shocked to learn that some one who stood in the general opinion for all that was honourable, has suddenly collapsed. Good men hearing such things are silent. For a moment our own personal security seems to shake. How did such a thing happen? We cannot say. This, however, we know, and we must believe it, not indeed that we may judge others, but that we may stand upon our own guard—an action, however sudden, is never really irrelevant or discontinuous to our habitual life. Every action had its secret

preparation. We judge no man, but we are here to judge ourselves; and the use to which we ought to put those tragic failures which are suddenly announced, is to see to it that we have no perilous stuff lying about the chambers of our soul, such as a sudden spark might kindle, overwhelming us in the glare.

The fact is, there are all sorts of things coiled up within each of us, and we are not safe until we have an absolute Master in the depths of our spirit.

'The heart aye's the part aye That mak's us right or wrang,' so said Burns.

'Keep thy heart with all diligence, for out of the heart are the issues of life,' so said a Psalmist.

'Whatsoever things are pure, true, honourable, lovely, . . . keep thinking on these things and the God of peace shall be with you,' so said an Apostle.<sup>1</sup>

### THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

#### The Shadow Christ.

'The word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Jeremiah, what seest thou? And I said, I see a rod of an almond tree.'—Jer 11.

There are classic men as there are classic books. The classic man is one who, speaking to his own age, strikes a note so deep, and true, and haunting that it sounds for ever; and such a man is the great prophet. Isaiah and Savonarola may deal with civic affairs, St. Paul and Luther with the freedom of the soul, Ezekiel and Augustine with the outward altar, St. John and Bunyan with the passion for perfection; but underneath all diversities of gift and testimony they bear witness for the Eternal, uniting the two tokens of a god-illuminated man. They turn the hearts of the fathers to their sons, and the hearts of the sons to their fathers; that is, they dispose the old to moral forwardness, to reverence for the new, and the young to spiritual wisdom, to reverence for the age-long values of the past. All who truly speak in the name of God, and as for His will, unite a profound piety with an unconquerable hope.

No other race can show a nobler dynasty of moral genius than the Hebrew; and in their long, troubled, revealing history there is no figure more heroic, none at once more tragic and triumphant than Jeremiah. Unfortunately, a shallow wit has misread his life, making him appear as a lachrymose weakling, tender and tearful, and so he is portrayed. He was, indeed, a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, but he was no more a 'weeping prophet'

<sup>1</sup> J. A. Hutton, *Our Ambiguous Life*, 106.



because he may have written the Lamentations that bear his name than Tennyson was a weeping poet because he wrote 'In Memoriam,' or Milton because he wrote 'Lycidas.' If his head was a fountain of tears there was reason for it, because he was doomed to the saddest fate that may befall a great, true-hearted, clear-minded man—the fate, that is, of living in an age of decay, ruin, and disaster, seeing it all, warning his people against it, but powerless to stay or avert it. History knows no darker tragedy, and therefore no figure grander, more lonely, more pathetic than the Suffering Servant of God.

All spiritual experience is mysterious, but with the prophet-soul the mystery deepens because his nature is more open to the Unseen—as we may see in the call of Jeremiah. In Palestine the almond-tree puts forth its buds early, and is the first tree to prophesy the coming of spring—the Hebrews called it the Watchful Tree. One day, stirred in spirit, the young Jeremiah walked in the fields, drinking in the early beauty of the Flowers of Watchfulness, and there flashed into his mind the thought of God as the Great Watcher. In a mood dross-drained and holy, wakefulness to natural beauty lifted him into the presence of One who never sleeps nor slumbers, and the prophet plighted his faith in a vision that never faded amid all the dark confusions of his life. Times came when the inequalities of life, the welfare of the wicked, and the downfall of his nation, forced upon him keen questionings; but if his life was wintry, like the watchful tree he kept always the prophecy of spring.

Truly he was a man of like passions with ourselves, as all the great ones are, albeit endowed with the sorrowful and great gift of prophecy, responsive to God as an Æolian harp to the wind, and eager to discover and obey His will. He saw clearly the hardships, the persecutions, the ostracism, and the defeats that awaited him, as they await every great and sane soul in a day of insanity. He was keenly aware of qualities in himself that hindered rather than helped his work, the questioning that weakened action, the hunger for a fellowship denied, the feeling of helplessness in the presence of his task. Yet he walked a straight course through a long, dangerous career, kept his faith in God, and became one of those sons of the Spirit whose influence never dies.

What wonder that this tormented man made discoveries of the power and possibilities of prayer, such as no one had made before? None before him had so clearly passed beyond perdition into

that larger, deeper field of fellowship with God. Jeremiah asked little; he prayed much. He was the father of that truer, profounder prayer which does not ask for things, but for God; not for gifts, but for the Giver. It was this mastery of the uses of prayer that made him so clear-sighted a leader, who did not mistake a reformation for a regeneration, or the form for the reality. Out of sorrow, out of ruin, out of defeat he rose victorious and became a prophet of the Eternal Religion.<sup>1</sup>

In Jeremiah's mind there were two opposite beliefs. The first was belief in God's justice and holiness and hatred of sin, and therefore he believed in the destruction of Israel. The nation was rotten at heart. He saw that corruption was the prelude to death. Israel must be scattered and winnowed as in a threshing-machine. Yet along with that strong moral conviction there was faith in God's promise. Their history, he was assured, would not go for nothing, and therefore he believed in the future of Israel. But how? How reconcile these two beliefs? The problem to Jeremiah was not the Exile, but *the sin*. God could bring back Israel from exile. But what good would it do to bring back Israel if it be the same Israel? The seeds of ruin are in them and can bring forth nothing but death. Brooding lovingly over Israel, he had revealed to him Israel's hope. He gained spiritual comprehension, and saw that the Israel of the future would not be an Israel of kindred blood but of kindred souls. Israel henceforth would be a Church rather than a nation. He saw that instead of the old covenant which God made with their fathers, there would be a new covenant which God would make with every soul that would meet Him.

The first step in this great revelation was the knowledge that morality is an individual concern. God and the human soul is the watchword. 'In those days they shall say no more, The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge. But every one shall die for his own iniquity: every man that eateth, his teeth shall be set on edge.' The inevitableness of sin breeding sin had formerly oppressed Jeremiah. But now he sees that at each point there is a possibility of breaking away from the power and doom of sin. He sees that morality is individual, and that God judges a man not for the sins of others, but for his own sin.

That was but a step. It did not solve the problem, How can the possibility become fact, and a sinful people become holy? Then in the despair of love he arrived at this great climax of prophecy.

<sup>1</sup> J. F. Newton, *The Sword of the Spirit*, 160.

The old covenant was broken, but (and this thought, so familiar to us, was the wonderful thing that came to the prophet), 'I will make a new covenant, saith the Lord. I will put my law in their inward parts, and in their heart will I write it; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people.' And as for the problem of sin, there will be a new beginning altogether, the past shall be put away, obliterated, 'for I will forgive their iniquity, and their sin will I remember no more.' This is the great revelation which cheered Jeremiah. It is one of the beginnings of that closer relationship between God and man which Christ brought. Here are the germs of the full salvation. Here are promised the forgiveness of sin, the reign of grace for the reign of law, God winning men by love, man serving God for love. Jeremiah's eye caught the first rays of the light, saw the foreshadows of the new covenant that was to be. He saw that religion in its essence was a personal relation between the soul and God.<sup>1</sup>

Here is the New Covenant to the fulfilment of which Jesus gave His life, and thus it is that Jeremiah is so often associated with Him. Jeremiah, lifted by his sorrow into the shadow of a mighty, redeeming love, became, so to speak, 'the almost Christ, the Christ of the night—a shadow Christ.' Just so we must bear about in our hearts, yea, even in our bodies, the marks of the Lord Jesus, that we may show forth the sacrifice of Christ till He come—each in his own way, and in his own degree, a Shadow Christ.

Most sincerely  
Let me follow where Thou ledest;  
Let me, bleeding where Thou bleedest,  
Die, if dying I may give  
Life to one who asks to live,  
And more nearly,  
Living thus, resemble Thee.

SEPTUAGESIMA.

### Increasing the Values of the World.

'Be fruitful.'—Gn 1<sup>28</sup>.

The first chapter of the Book of Genesis is full of the sense of God's joy in His work of creation. Once and again we are told that God saw that it was good. And His will that the world should be a world of rich productiveness is vividly declared. 'Be fruitful' is the word which expresses God's purpose for the world. We seem far enough from

the idyllic picture suggested by these ancient words. But it is still true that the fundamental matter in our existence is the matter of productiveness. To advance in every way the fruitfulness of the world is a high and most worthy calling. The producer is the fundamental benefactor of the world.

1. There is the matter of production in the material world. The man who co-operates with Nature and, as a tiller of the soil or a herdsman, is a worker for the fruitfulness of the world, is still our fundamental man. He provides us with food to eat and with clothes to wear. All civilization rests at last on agriculture.

The man who brings forth the treasures of the mines and bends the forces of Nature to his purpose is a producer to whose work we all pay toll. Every time a new and effective machine is invented, the world is a more potential place in which to live. And the machine is to make possible a republic where every man can be a ruler. The world of material things has come to be a bewildering world. And in the midst of it all man moves the master of the forces which he has released. The worker who understands the significance of it all has a great pride in this amazing fruitfulness of the human mind. He has his great dream of a world where in the noblest way every man is a producer and where the values of the world are increased by the labour of every human being.

The fundamental duty of being a producer, of having a share in the fruitfulness of the world, cannot be stated with too much emphasis. John Ruskin put it powerfully once when he said, 'No man has a right to eat a meal which he has not earned.' The problem of a true man is the question of finding the fashion in which he can be the most effective producer of the most important values.

2. Mankind is responsible for mental production as well as for material production. The normal world is not a world where the vast multitudes are productive in the material realm, and only a few in the world of the mind. Mental fruitfulness is to be the portion of every man and every woman and every child. And, where it is not, one can only say that society has failed to function in complete and adequate fashion.

There is one mind which every man can bring to fuller power and larger value all the time. And that mind is his own. It is also true that while he is doing this he will be affecting other minds and making it easier for them to reach their full capacity. There is always danger that a clever man may suppose that adroitness is real mental power. But it is the mind which is a sure and dependable in-

<sup>1</sup> H. Black, *According to my Gospel*, 96.



strument for the finding of the truth, for coming into understanding contact with reality, which is the mind actually attaining the highest value to its possessor and to the world.

Here it is important to realize the difference between manipulation and production. When a man invents an instrument which humanity needs, and as a result secures large returns, he is receiving the reward of actual productiveness. When a man applies his mind to making the largest use of existing instruments of value he is in effect adding to their number. But when a man by deft manipulation secures such control of the market or such a relation to certain stocks that he secures a return without rendering a corresponding service, he is not a producer. In a very ignoble sense he is a manipulator. The world really has a harder lot because he is living in it, and all his gains have an odour about them which the real producer recognizes with distaste. The man who is choosing his life-work must face the full significance of this fundamental distinction. Does the work of which he is thinking involve a real and necessary service to the world, or is it merely a matter of becoming a participant in the battle of wits as to who shall be able to get control of the largest amount of the spoil?

To be sure, the realm of production is a large one. On the mental side it includes the securing, and the interpreting and executive activities, of a system of wise laws. It includes all necessary tasks of organization and administration. But it does not include any activity which is a method of obtaining values without rendering a corresponding service. The man who is a mere manipulator is one of the most sinister, and in a fashion one of the most pitiable, figures in a world where God intended every man to be a producer.

3. There is a great enterprise in relation to moral fruitfulness in the world. A wise man once declared that the purpose of humanity was to propagate life and character. The fruitfulness of humanity finds a particularly happy expression in the social spirit. And this social spirit, although it has to do with many men and women and many little children, must find lodgment in particular minds and hearts. There is no brotherly feeling which floats about in the world at large, sweetening life, without having any contact with particular lives. The new society is produced as individual men are saved from the selfish mind and become possessed of the social mind. When a man commits the Golden Rule to his life, and not merely to his memory, he is producing, as far as his own character

is concerned, the social spirit. Most people are very happy to apply the social spirit to their own circle, but there are masses of people all about them who simply never come within that circle. When Thomas Mott Osborne said he wanted every criminal to come to the place where he would think of all other men as his pals, he was setting forth an ideal which would have transforming effect outside our penal institutions. The social mind considers all other minds significant. It is ready to offer to each a real quality of comradeship. It is ready to find in each something to love. And it thinks of human nature as the most wonderful land in its perpetual possibilities as regards the discovery of new and glorious and unsuspected treasures.

4. The highest of all the values of the world are the spiritual values. And our fruitfulness is by no means complete until it includes the realm of the spirit. Most of us have known some people who somehow gave us a sense of spiritual altitude. It is not that they were posing. It is not that they were conscious of spiritual height. The charm and the wonder were just their entire unconsciousness. They were all the while assuming that other people looked at the world from their own lofty position. And in an astonishing number of cases people rose to the demand. It is tremendously hard to disappoint sincere spiritual expectation. We all know, when we stop to think of it, that the people of spiritual height are the great people in any enterprise. The command to be fruitful comes to a climax of meaning in this field of spiritual values. Jesus was the supreme example of spiritual worth. And He has kept imparting great secrets of spiritual productiveness to men these twenty centuries. The consciousness of the nearness of God and the consciousness of the commanding reality of spiritual things, alive in a human being, are really the greatest wealth to be found in all this world.

In all these ways each generation is to increase the values to be found on this planet. It is to be richer in material values because we have lived. It is to be richer in character because we have walked the ways of the earth. It is to be richer in mental power and in attained knowledge because we have used our minds. It is to be richer in social interest and consecration because we have moved among men. It is to be richer in the sense of beauty, in the possession of beautiful things, and in the possession of the invisible beauty which speaks through material things, because we have lived to love the things which have clean beauty and

noble grace. It is to be a world richer in all those attributes of the spirit which come from an awareness of God, and all the realities which lift this mortal into the realm of immortality. In every way we are to be producers, and add to the values of the world.

It is with almost a shock of recognition that we realize how deeply productive was the life of Jesus in all these fashions. He released forces which increased every sort of real value there is in the world. In this deep sense His was the most productive life of history. The triumph of His kingdom means the conservation of every noble value in the life of this world, and the attainment of every completion of value in the world to come.<sup>1</sup>

#### SEXAGESIMA.

#### Then came Jesus.

'Then came Jesus, the doors being shut.'—Jn 20<sup>26</sup>.

All the doors by which any might find access from the outside were carefully barred. The shutters were closed: none might know what was passing behind those doors. For the thoughts and words of the men within were too bitter and dark for the mocking world without to know and scorn. The only way to escape awkward questions and the piercing glances of a cruel world was to bar the doors and shut out the past. And the doors were shut, shut against the outer world, shut also in the face of the possible return of Christ.

1. Strange it is to reflect that the door of entrance was first closed against the coming of Christ, not by His enemies, but by His professing disciples. It was the first, but not the last, time that the doors were closed in the face of the Church's Head by the heads of the Church. Over and over again have blind and faithless and ignorant Church leaders closed the door, seeking to deny the presence and comfort of the Christ of God to all save such as they thought fit to grant it to. Sometimes these arrogant ecclesiastics have been jewelled and mitred popes and prelates excommunicating some faithful believer who claimed for himself and his little flock only the right to worship their God according to the dictates of conscience. And sometimes they have been black-coated Free Churchmen gathered in General Assembly, who with smug and unctuous piety have condemned the man who would not adopt their narrow and complacent creed, or who refused to surrender his

<sup>1</sup> L. H. Hough, *The Renaissance of Religion*, 109.

Christian liberty and intellectual honesty in order to purchase an unworthy peace.

And must I back to darkness go  
Because I cannot say their creed?  
I know not what I think; I know  
Only that Thou art what I need.

And though they have shut fast every door against the honest man, Jesus has come to His disciple, as He always does.

That is a great announcement in the Gospel of St. Luke, the knell of arrogant orthodoxy, of self-satisfied traditionalism, and all manners and forms of religion that have not the stamp of freedom and fearless truth. 'In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judæa, and Herod being tetrarch of Galilee, and his brother Philip tetrarch of the region of Iturea and Trachonitis, and Lysanias tetrarch of Abilene, in the high-priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas, the word of God came unto John the son of Zacharias in the wilderness.'

No matter how tightly barred the doors, no matter how bare the desert, the eternal Word of God comes where there is a true and honest heart to receive Him. He comes through all the doors which the hand and will of man have closed, and speaks to the faithful His own word of peace.

2. And there are other doors—doors which a man has shut with his own hand, barring them against any who would come in to disturb the brooding of his inmost soul. Perhaps we too harbour a sense of disappointment, a feeling of failure, and of loss. We too knew that Nazarene in wonderful old-time days, when His presence gave us peace and His word assurance. But we let them take and crucify Him. We let Him go out of our lives, and now we know not really whether He be alive or not.

But He comes. The doors being shut, Jesus comes.

Just when we are safest, there's a sunset-touch,  
A fancy from a flower-bell, some one's death,  
A chorus-ending from Euripides,—  
And that's enough.

Through every apparent obstacle—material, intellectual, moral—Christ finds His way. If through fear of consequences, or borne down by the difficulties of belief, men seek refuge in temporary expedients, sooner or later they find themselves face to face with Him. In the crises of individual souls, in the strange vicissitudes of human history, over and over again when it seemed that men had



done with Him, 'then came Jesus, the doors being shut.'

Do not let us delude ourselves into thinking that His coming means nothing. It will mean a big change in our lives and destiny if we let Him abide, and it will have an eternal issue if we do not. Sometimes we wish that we could flee from His presence and ignore His demands. The Cross comes to every man with a challenge; and there is no escape from the response. Jesus stands in the midst—a Presence that is not to be put by. The late George Tyrrell, in a letter written before one of his controversies with his ecclesiastical superiors, said, 'How glad one would be to get out of it all! but there is that strange Man on His Cross who drives me back again and again.' Often and often we are like crying out, 'What have I to do with Thee, Thou Jesus of Nazareth? Art Thou come to torment me?' But a thousand times worse the torments and tortures of the life that tries to keep Him out! Endless and unavailing the doubts and fears and uneasiness till a man has settled this business between himself and God.

3. 'Then came Jesus, the doors being shut.' It was the time of the disciples' greatest need, the hour of their deepest perplexity. *Then* cometh Jesus.

Jesus waits till the recognized and acknowledged hour of a man's need. When all the doors of earthly hope and wit and invention are shut—then cometh Jesus. It is that experience which the Psalmist records in his picture of the sea-going men. They know a good deal about the handling of their craft—up to a certain point. But when the biggest storm of all arises, and they are 'at

their wits' end, then——' then what? 'Then they cry unto the Lord in their trouble'; and even if the waves had been no stiller, the hearts that looked out at them were. The thought of Him who holdeth the sea in the hollow of His hand brought them composure. 'Then are they glad because they are quiet.' 'At their wits' end then——' then God!

If doors did not have the habit of closing, we should feel no need of God. We need to be brought to the end of wits in order that we may come to the beginning of faith. We need to have every door closed in order that Christ may enter.

Unbelief and sin and failure did not prevent His coming. We are not told that He swung those doors open: He came *through* them. Many of the doors leading out into a larger and a fuller life we have closed through our sin and carelessness and indifference and folly. The Lord Christ does not swing these misdeeds of ours miraculously out of our way. All their days some men will have to live behind doors which they have closed for themselves, doors of usefulness and hope and opportunity and good health. But though Christ does not remove these things He comes through them. Through the heaviest and most impenetrable obstacle He comes to us in our need. Through the darkest, heaviest, most iron-bound, sin-bolted door, His white presence can come to set us free.

Behold Him now where He comes;

Not the Christ of our subtle creeds,

But the light of our hearts, of our homes,  
Of our hopes, our prayers, our needs.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> H. L. Simpson, *The Nameless Longing*, 280.

## Contributions and Comments.

### Again the Magnificat.

WHEN I wrote recently a brief communication to THE EXPOSITORY TIMES under the heading 'Mary or Elizabeth,' I had no intention of dealing with the whole question of the sources of Luke in his first chapter, but only of rectifying a single word in the textual tradition. The correction of a single wrongly transcribed word looks innocent enough, but it loses the appearance of innocence when it involves not only one's judgment as to the possible

correctness of what is known as a Western Reading, and equally as a harder reading, but also the intrusion of the textual critic into the region of ecclesiastical psalmody and the correction of the heading of the most popular and most generally received of New Testament Psalms. We have had our troubles over the traditional authorship of Old Testament Psalms, and are well aware that when David is quoted for the authorship of songs which he never contributed, the problem raised is of greater moment than appears when the question is first started.

The problem of authorship in the 110th Psalm cannot be treated as an Old Testament problem, in view of its reaction upon 'David calling him Lord' in the New Testament; in such a case it is quite possible that the last word has not been said. In some respects the problem whether Mary in the Spirit sang the Magnificat is a similar problem; if she did not sing it, then we are wrong in saying, for ages and generations, that she did so sing it. As we said, in upsetting the text, we overset the choir. If we were to take the verse of the old hymn in the *Book of good and godly ballads*, and instead of saying:

There Mary sings Magnificat  
In tones surpassing sweet,  
And all the Virgins bear their part  
Singing about her feet,

we were to put in the name of Elizabeth, the verse wouldn't scan, and the virgins would leave off singing. Something like the imagined case of the old Scotch ballad is the case of the Church at large. The correction won't scan! The choirmasters (Asaph and Jeduthun and the rest) shake their heads at us. Literary and liturgical instincts are alike affronted.

Returning now to the simple question which I raised in the form 'Mary or Elizabeth?' I have had several communications which remind me that we are dealing with something wider than a textual problem. It will be remembered that we introduced two new considerations over and above the age-long question whether a Western text (in this case the text of Irenæus) can be original. First we pointed out that literary criticism, which in such a matter is almost infallible, assigns the Lucan hymns to a single hand; they are literary compositions, not the spontaneities of the Holy Ghost. Second, if this be admitted, the motive of both the *Benedictus* and the *Magnificat* can be detected in an underlying play upon the meaning of the name of Zacharias, which in Hebrew is equal to 'the Lord hath remembered.' Both of the compositions are Zacharias hymns, from which it follows incidentally that the original of either was written in Hebrew or some Semitic dialect; the last point has long been suspected. From all of which it appears that the *Magnificat*, as well as the *Benedictus*, is a thanksgiving over the birth of John the Baptist, and that the *Magnificat* must as certainly be assigned to Elizabeth as the *Benedictus* to Zacharias. At this point my correspondents advise me that the matter cannot be left hanging in the air in this fashion. One of them writes to remind me that the idea that

the name of Zacharias was involved in the *Benedictus* is not new, but that it had already been suggested by Plummer, in his commentary on Luke, that not only the name of Zacharias was involved, with its Semitic association, but that the names of Elizabeth and John were equally played upon, Elizabeth because her name involves 'the oath of God' (=the oath which He swore, 1<sup>78</sup>), and John because he interprets 'the Divine Grace and Mercy' (1<sup>54</sup>, 72, 78). From this reminder (for which I am grateful), it becomes the more probable that we were correct in assigning the Lucan hymns to the Nativity of John the Baptist and not to the Birth of Jesus. They are harmonious in their inward intention as well as in their literary structure. Every test that we can apply confirms us in the opinion that we ought to read Elizabeth, and not Mary. The matter does not, however, end there.

It has been remarked that there is a certain dependence of the *Magnificat* upon the Song of Hannah in the First Book of Samuel, and various reasons have been suggested for the imitation of the Birth-Song in the Old Testament by the Birth-Song in the New. On the one hand, it may be argued that the Song in Samuel, being the story of a barren woman, who has unexpectedly produced offspring, is more appropriate to Elizabeth than to Mary; on the other hand, it may be said that any peculiarly Elizabethan features have not been transferred to the *Magnificat*. Those who debate the question in this manner have, however, neglected to observe the setting of the Song in the Old Testament, which furnishes the real parallel and makes the actual link between the two compositions. Both sides have failed to observe that Hannah's Prayer and not her supposed Song is the real link. The Scripture says expressly that Hannah prayed to the Lord, and said:

'O Lord of hosts . . . Remember thine handmaid, and do not forget me, but give me a man-child';

and when the prayer is answered it is said that 'the Lord remembered her.'

Here, then, we have the Zacharias motive full-blown: 'Jahweh, remember me,' followed by 'Jahweh remembered her.' We can take Zacharias out of the text and put it as a summary on the margin, as we suggested in the case of the *Benedictus*. This seems to be decisive that the *Magnificat* is also a Zacharias hymn, depending not only on the Song of Hannah, but also on the setting of the Song, where the Zacharias motive is incontestable. So we see once more that the Western text



of Luke was right, to wit the Old Latin, Irenæus and Origen, in reading Elizabeth in place of Mary in the introduction of the *Magnificat*.

Almost at the same time that I was writing my note on the matter of the Lucan variants, there appeared a little book, with the arresting title of the *Lost Book of the Nativity of John*, in which an attempt was made to reconstruct out of the Birth Stories of Matthew and Luke, with some assistance from Apocryphal quarters, a Birth Story for John the Baptist, such as may have been in the hands of Luke when writing his Gospel. It would be far from my desire to criticise unfairly or adversely Mr. Hugh Schonfield's somewhat audacious venture into the Higher Criticism of the New Testament, though I do not like startling or sensational titles, which have a tendency to mislead even those who are willing to be enlightened. In any case Mr. Schonfield must be right that there is not merely Johannine matter, but an actual Johannine document latent in the first chapter of Luke. If he drives his team, that is, his theme, hard, we will call him Jehu, and do our best to follow; if too hard, other people will call him Phaethon. We prefer to think of him under the former title, and to wish him well with his future and further studies; for textual criticism and literary criticism, when yoked together, are capable of a more rapid motion than is commonly accorded to them.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

Birmingham.

### Matthew v. 39.

μη ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ. Four suggested translations of these words are:

- (1) 'Resist not evil' (AV).
- (2) 'Resist not him that is evil' (RV).
- (3) 'Resist not the evil one' (Chrysostom).
- (4) 'You are not to resist an injury' (Moffatt).

In *The Ethical Teaching of Jesus* (p. 72), E. F. Scott quotes the AV, 'Resist not evil,' and, appealing to the context, argues that what Jesus here forbids is retaliation, which means that 'when wrong is done to your own person, do not answer it with a similar wrong; endure the evil done to you and overcome it with good.' Here, admittedly, is an interpretation. That it is true to the spirit of Jesus' teaching, might, I think, be granted, and, if so, may supply a clue to an adequate translation.

On p. 74 Professor Scott devotes a paragraph

to showing how these words of Jesus express His judgment on the futility of evil. To retaliate is to add another wrong to the first, and so on *ad infinitum*. Professor Scott argues in support of this that *μη ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ* should be translated, 'Resist not the evil one,' and that, when so translated, the words 'acquire an emphatic meaning.' The 'evil one' is Satan, so that Jesus, realizing 'that the powers of evil are all leagued together,' and therefore that Satan cannot really cast out Satan, is virtually saying, 'Do not cast out the devil with his own weapons.'

The first point to be noted here is that the AV translation, 'evil,' is now rejected in favour of 'the evil one.' In the second place, I feel that the argument by which Professor Scott tries to support the latter translation is unnecessarily subtle and laboured, and adds little to the arguments usually advanced in its favour.

It would seem better to interpret the words in a personal and particular sense with a human reference. The RV suggests this, but, for a reason to be advanced later, is otherwise unsatisfactory. Such a personal interpretation seems to gain support from the context. Vv.<sup>38, 39</sup> read: 'Ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρήθη Ὁφθαλμὸν ἀντὶ ὀφθαλμοῦ καὶ ὀδὸντα ἀντὶ ὀδόντος. ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν *μη ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ*.' ἄλλ' ὅστις σε *ράπτει* εἰς τὴν δεξιὰν *σιαγόνα* σου, στρέφον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην. Though the maxim, 'An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth,' quoted from Ex 21<sup>24</sup>, is in a general and abstract form, Jesus is evidently thinking in particular and personal terms, as the words ἄλλ' ὅστις *ράπτει* . . . show. *τῷ πονηρῷ* would thus be in a sequence, not of form, but of sense, with the quoted maxim. Now what we seem to need is a translation of *μη ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ*, which will exhibit unambiguously the nature, source, and direction of the wrong, and if possible make easy the transition in thought from the general form of the OT maxim to the particular form in which, I think, Jesus exhibits His own principle.

The AV, 'Resist not evil,' is unsatisfactory in that it seems to counsel non-resistance of all evil, whilst RV, 'Resist not him that is evil,' fails to strike the note of personal non-retaliation which the context seems to call for. Moffatt's translation, 'You are not to resist an injury,' is in many respects attractive. Clearly, of course, it involves an element of interpretation, and indicates that Moffatt feels the essential reference is to a definite injury—a committed act. The translation is not altogether free from ambiguity, however; it is not put beyond doubt (without further inference



from the context) that the injury one is not to resist is only injury done to oneself, nor does the abstract noun, 'injury,' necessarily indicate that the injury referred to is only that inflicted by persons—two ideas clearly necessary if the teaching is that of non-retaliation as expounded by Professor Scott.

I would suggest 'resist not your wicked assailant.'

This is proffered with much diffidence—and not without misgivings as to the felicity of the expression—as an attempt to combine unambiguousness with as close an adherence as possible to what seems to me to be the meaning of the passage. The advantages I would suggest for this translation are: (1) It makes a natural transition from the abstract and general form of the quoted maxim to the personal and particular form which Jesus' thought seems to require, at the most natural place, *i.e.* immediately following the maxim itself.

(2) It fits in well with the sense and form of the words that follow.

(3) It retains the force of *πονηρῶ* 'wicked'—here 'wicked' as applied to particular acts, rather than 'evil' by disposition.

(4) 'Assailant' expresses the notion which it seems desirable to supply from the context, and indicates what Moffatt's word 'injury' does not clearly do, the personal source of the injury.

(5) The word 'your' makes clear the notion that the abstention from resistance applies only to injuries done to oneself.

The whole passage would thus read: 'You have heard that it was said, an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth; but I say unto you, Resist not your wicked assailant; but whosoever smites you on the right cheek, turn to him the other also.'

E. WALLACE ARCHER.

*Yale University, New Haven.*

## The 'Second Coming': Its Historic Fulfilment.

If Jesus kept His promise—and He did—when? The question is important, seeing that there are thousands of Christian people in all the churches, and in religious organizations outside them, who are still expecting a physical and spectacular return of Christ. The expectation is founded upon the fact that the disciples, apostles, and first Christians looked for His physical reappearance in their day.

For had not Jesus said, 'There are some standing here who shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom' (Mt 16<sup>28</sup>, Mk 9<sup>1</sup>, Lk 9<sup>27</sup>). But when one after another of the disciples and apostles passed away, until well-nigh all those who had known Jesus after the flesh had disappeared and Jesus had not returned, it was naturally found desirable to put on record memorabilia of His sayings and doings. This allows room, of course, for the variations we find in them.

St. Luke tells us (Ac 1<sup>10, 11</sup>) that the two white-robed men, who came to the apostles at the Ascension, said to them, 'this Jesus, who was received up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye beheld him going into heaven.' Thus the expectation passed over the real fulfilment (see below). Wherever St. Paul refers to the subject in his letters, it is always the visible, physical reappearance he predicts (1 Th 4<sup>15-17</sup>, 2 Th 1<sup>7-10</sup>, 1 Co 15<sup>7</sup>). And so forward into the early Christian centuries. It finds expression in the Creeds, as can readily be verified. The 'Apostles' Creed' states as an article of faith, 'And (Jesus Christ) sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.' The Athanasian Creed adds, 'At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies, and shall give account of their own works.' The Nicene and that of St. Epiphanius say 'is coming' (*καὶ ἐρχόμενον ἐν δόξῃ*, etc.). It is very doubtful if the compilers of the latter two had the idea of present spiritual realization in their use of the 'continuous present,' as Canon Bindley (*THE EXPOSITORY TIMES*, November 1929, p. 93) would like, and we could wish, to believe. He says, 'True teaching would have insisted that the Christ is always present: that the Judgment is always being enacted: that the evil character or the evil action carries its own punishment within itself.' Yes, we in these latter days can see that that is absolutely true, but it is almost certain that the compilers had no such psychological interpretation; and that they conceived the 'coming' as objective and to take place on some future but definite day. The 'continuous present tense' is a prophetic statement, 'He is coming,' rather than refers to a present spiritual process. At any rate the Christian Church has always so understood it, and so understands it still.

But to get to Christ's literal fulfilment of His promise, we must return to the N.T. and to the Gospel of St. John, who, though St. Mark adds,



in the concluding sentence of the promise, 'till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power' (Mk 9<sup>1</sup>), is the most spiritual of them all. He reports Jesus as saying, 'And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may be with you for ever, even the Spirit of truth' (14<sup>16, 17</sup>). 'But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father . . . he shall testify of me' (15<sup>26</sup>). 'A little while, and ye shall not see me: and again a little while, and ye shall see me; because I go to the Father' (16<sup>16</sup>). Could any words be plainer in their indication that He was going away soon, and would soon come again? And His insistence on the coming of the Spirit should have prepared them for the fact that *His Second Coming was on the Day of Pentecost*.

The disciples did not expect Him thus, and did not recognize Him when He came. Their minds and imaginations were insufficient for the strain of perception or comprehension. Down to the last five minutes of Jesus's life on earth they expected the earthly kingdom under Jesus as Messiah, 'Lord, wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel.' Even so here, they were 'slow of heart,' and did not recognize the Descent of the Spirit as the fulfilment of the promise. But Christ did then come, and there can never be any physical reappearance. Scientifically—and let it be said with reverence—the reassembling of the physical body of Jesus is not possible; nor did the Divine Father intend it to be. The whole matter is one of spiritual interpretation. There have been thousands of 'comings' since then. The Holy Spirit, and the perpetual experience of Him in the Church and the individual soul, is the real 'continuous present' 'unto the end of the world.' If one lives in the Spirit, he is, even now, in personal communion with the personal Christ, who ever liveth and reigneth with the Father in the unity of the Redemptional Trinity.

JAMES FEATHER.

*St. Helens, Hastings.*

## The Passage of the Red Sea.

DR. SCULLARD's very interesting and well-nigh exhaustive article (in your November issue) on the above subject, omits to mention Lake Menzaleh as the possible *Yam Suph* ('Reed Sea' and not 'Red Sea'). If Moses met the Pharaoh on the 'Field of Zoan' (LXX 'Tanis'), according to

Ps 78<sup>12</sup>, would not this lake be the barrier to the escape of Israel?

Do reeds grow in salt water?

D. CUNILLO DAVIES.

*Machynlleth, North Wales.*

## Acts xxviii. 3.

RECENTLY when I was addressing some Boys' Brigade campers on Ac 28<sup>3</sup>, 'And when Paul had gathered a bundle of sticks, and laid them on the fire, there came a viper out of the heat, and fastened on his hand,' several things occurred to my mind.

First of all, St. Paul, notwithstanding the insistence of scholars upon his being a townsman, and taking most of his illustrations from the forum and the stadium, had the real love of a fire in the open—which distinguishes the out-of-doors boy and man.

Secondly, St. Paul did not leave all the work to the others. Leader of men as he was, he himself set about gathering sticks. No job that needs doing is too humble for a great man.

But thirdly, *he must have been rather blind, for he gathered a poisonous snake among the sticks.* A torpid snake might easily be mistaken for a stick by a very short-sighted man, who would only discover his mistake when the heat had wakened into life the dormant reptile.

Has this evidence ever been adduced to support the well-known diagnosis of the 'thorn in the flesh'? I have searched all the books available to me and can find no mention of this suggestion.

I have never seen a hibernating adder myself, but recently on a fishing expedition, and when making a fire, I very nearly mistook a dead eel for a half-decayed twig.

I wonder if any of the N.T. critics has ever quoted the incident of the viper as proof of St. Paul's eye trouble.

W. PHIN GILLIESON.

*Ayr.*

---

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.